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Program Goals and Objectives

Fundamentally, the Literature Program seeks to provide its students with an educational experience that promotes skills-based learning as well as the intellectual awareness and maturity that are the hallmarks of a liberal arts education. Stressing analysis and synthesis in reading and writing in all of our classes, our curriculum has eight objectives:

1. Students will be able to identify the forms of literature and to understand the specific characteristics of each form and the demands it makes on its audience.
2. They will gain a sense of the cultural contexts of literature as well as its historical continuities and discontinuities.
3. They will understand and be able to apply methods of literary and critical analysis so that their interpretations are based on acceptable methodologies.
4. They will understand and be able to apply both the techniques and various materials of literary research so that they may place and understand those interpretations in the context of ongoing scholarship in the field.
5. They will become conversant in the computer and technological literacies that now intersect and influence literary studies.
6. They will develop their writing and speaking abilities so that they may communicate their ideas about literature clearly and persuasively and/or produce original creative works.
7. They will learn to think independently.
8. They will learn to work collaboratively.

These are concepts and skills that we believe can be taught and that this document will demonstrate that we are successfully instructing. Our program website lists fifteen specific skills that we teach our students. These skills directly relate to the eight objectives. In our courses students learn:

1. to apply close reading skills to any piece of literature (objective 3)
2. to analyze a work into its components (objective 1)
3. to recognize and understand the intrinsic elements of any literary work (e.g., mythologies, symbols, metaphors, dreams, etc.) (objective 1)
4. to be familiar with the literary characteristics of the major literary genres (objective 1)
5. to present analysis to others as cogent, coherent, and interesting arguments, in written papers, oral presentations, and multi-media formats in individual and/or collaborative formats (objective 5, 6 & 8)
6. to tap the enormous research resources available to support interpretation and insight (objective 4)
7. to understand the intertextual nature of western literature, that is, the idea that writers are always reworking the forms, ideas and stories of the past (objective 2 & 3)
8. to know that literature is produced in historical contexts and to identify those contexts (objective 2)
9. to understand the benefits and liabilities of the idea that there are literary periods (objective 2 & 3)
10. to understand the benefits and liabilities of the idea of literary canons, and to read literature produced by male and female authors from a variety of cultural, ethnic, racial, and economic backgrounds (objective 2 & 3)
11. to be familiar with the concepts and applications of some major critical theories and schools of criticism (objective 3)
12. to understand the effects of the digitization of texts and about the future of texts and textuality (objective 5)
13. to understand the relationships between texts and technology, in particular the effects of computing and networks on contemporary literature, literary practice, and textuality (objective 5)
14. to understand what plagiarism is and how to avoid it (objective 7)
15. to create and revise their own writing, creative or critical (objective 6)

There are a few other goals that cannot be stated as precisely, but they are equally important to our program and the mission of a Liberal Arts education. They are, we realize after many years of teaching, not the sorts of things one can put in a syllabus. They are the result of both individual and community effort. Therefore, while the program does not explicitly teach these objectives, we hope our students leave the Literature program inspired with the following abilities and values:

1. We want our literature majors to develop confidence in their considerable abilities. We become concerned when we hear our students put themselves down.
2. We want our students to come to love literature—if they do not already when they attend our classes—as we do.
3. We want our students to know the feeling of “owning” the work of literature they are reading.
4. Finally, we would like our students to have inquiring and critical minds so that they will not accept anyone’s opinions until they have thoroughly read a work and researched its meaning.

In short, we would like them to develop the skills of life-long learners and supporters of the arts. These are the important skills, concepts, and attitudes that we want each of them to have when they leave us. (Most of them do.) This happens when students wrestle with their work as they go through the process of completing challenging assignments. This also happens when students share ideas and when they see themselves as part of an intellectual community, one that involves the active support of teachers, colleagues, and friends.

The skills described above prepare students for a range of careers. In brief, the Literature Program prepares students who can think critically and creatively and, just as importantly, write and speak well. The program’s emphasis on technological literacy, furthermore, provides training in another key communication skill that is increasingly valuable in today’s job market. While many of our majors indicate that they plan to pursue primary or secondary educational careers, we tie our curriculum and its objectives to no one specific career.
The National Leadership Council’s report for liberal education and America’s promise, “College Learning for the New Global Century,” supports the integrity of our goals and mission. The 2007 report issued by the American Association of Colleges and Universities outlines four “essential learning outcomes,” including knowledge of diverse cultures and critical and creative thinking skills (sharp written and oral communication, information literacy, and teamwork abilities) (24). The “new framework for excellence” outlined in the report also stresses civic responsibility and integrative learning. The report argues, “In a society as diverse as the United States, there can be no ‘one size-fits-all’ design for learning that serves all students and all areas of study” (16). As we outline, document, and discuss in this self-study, from our flexible but demanding curricular concentrations to our day-to-day classroom and community practices and assignments, the Literature program at Stockton College offers, as the Council’s “Principles of Excellence” call for, “both challenging standards and flexible guidance for an era of educational reform and renewal” (16).

Literature Program Faculty

The program has seven full-time members: Deborah Gussman (Assoc. Prof., American Literature), Lisa Honaker (Assoc. Prof., 19th and 20th century British Literature), Kristin Jacobson (Asst. Prof., American Literature), Thomas Kinsella (Assoc. Prof., 17th and 18th century British Literature), Nathan Long (Asst. Prof., Creative Writing), Brian Kim Stefans (Visiting Professor of New Media Studies), and Kenneth Tompkins (Prof., Medieval and Renaissance British Literature). Each faculty member contributes three, four-credit classes per semester, generally this consists of two program classes and one course in General Studies. Our vitae in Appendix V attest to the varied interests, specializations, and accomplishments we bring to the program.

Since our last 5-year review, we have hired three tenure-track positions at the assistant professor level in the following specializations: New Media Studies, post-1865 American Literature, and Creative Writing. Scott Rettberg joined the faculty in the fall of 2002 as the New Media specialist. In the fall of 2006 he took a leave of absence to teach in Norway and decided to leave Stockton in the fall of 2006. This spring we completed the process of hiring an Assistant Professor in New Media Studies to begin in the fall of 2007. After a national search, Brian Kim Stefans (M.F.A., Brown University) accepted the tenure-track position in New Media Studies. Both Nathan Long (Creative Writing) and Kristin Jacobson (post-1865 American Literature) joined the faculty in the fall of 2005. The American Literature position represented a new tenure-track line and the Creative Writing hire replaced Stephen Dunn, who is transitioning to retirement.

In the 2006/07 academic year we completed the process of hiring two new tenure-track faculty for the 2007/08 academic term: as mentioned above, one hire fills the New Media Studies position currently filled by a 13-D (full-time, visiting Assistant Professor) and the other represents a new line in Multi-Ethnic Literatures of the U.S. Adalaine Holton (Ph.D., University of California-Santa Cruz) accepted the tenure-track position in Multi-Ethnic Literatures of the U.S. Next academic year we will have eight full-time, tenured or tenure-track faculty.
Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty

Given our large number of undergraduate majors, we have a small, but dedicated, group of tenured and tenure-track faculty. Faculty CVs are included in Appendix V.

Deborah Gussman, Assoc. Prof., American Literature
Deborah Gussman researches the rhetoric of American women’s literature and Native American Indian writing in the early national period. She has recently published articles on Catharine Maria Sedgwick (in Catharine Maria Sedgwick: Critical Perspectives) and William Apess (in The New England Quarterly). A founding member of the Catharine Maria Sedgwick Society, she currently serves as the society’s Vice-President for Membership and Finance, and on the organizing committee for the upcoming 10th anniversary symposium.

Lisa Honaker, Assoc. Prof., 19th and 20th century British Literature
Lisa Honaker is pursuing research on late-Victorian literature. She published “Revolution in a ‘Poison Bad World’: The Revisionary Role of Gender in Robert Louis Stevenson’s New Arabian Nights and Prince Otto” in the September 2001 issue of English Literature in Transition. She is completing revision on an article on Stevenson’s Treasure Island, entitled “One Man to Rely One: Long John Silver and the Shifting Character of Victorian Boys’ Fiction.” She also received a Research and Professional Development grant for 2002-2003 to revise a third article on Stevenson, “Revenge of a Gothic Gnome: Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde and the ‘Re-vision’ of Late-Victorian Romance.” She plans to submit both articles for publication in refereed journals by summer’s end. She is also working on a review essay on Tessa Hadley’s Henry James and the Imagination of Pleasure to be published in English Literature in Transition.

Kristin J. Jacobson, Asst. Prof., American Literature
Kristin J. Jacobson’s current book project, Domestic Geographies: The Neodomestic American Novel, examines twentieth-century revisions of domestic fiction, a popular nineteenth-century genre. Her work investigates the place of the home and domesticity in contemporary American Literature and culture. She also plans to continue research on extreme forms of travel and nature writing, what Jacobson calls “adrenaline narratives.”

Thomas Kinsella, Assoc. Prof., 17th and 18th century British Literature
For the last few years Kinsella has been studying the Colonial American bookbinding trade for a book on the subject he is co-authoring with Willman Spawn, whose scholarship in the field extends over fifty years. Kinsella was awarded a sabbatical in the spring of 2002 to forward this research. A completed draft of the project is with publishers. He also recently completed an article on Arthur Murphy’s Life of Samuel Johnson for the annual The Age of Johnson. Prof. Kinsella has applied and been approved for a promotion to full Professor.

Nathan Long, Asst. Prof., Creative Writing
Nathan Long is completing a short story collection titled Conveyance. When complete, Conveyance will be comprised of about twenty stories linked thematically by travel—via foot, car, plane, train, bus, etc. While the stories have their own themes and topics, Long
hopes the collection will also convey how characters’ actions and beliefs are influenced by motion and, more specifically, by each particular mode of transportation. Long is a consummate traveler, having crossed the US more than twenty times, using various means of travel, from bicycle and dog sled to jetliner. While both travel writing and the ‘road trip’ novel are popular in American literature, there are few story collections that center on modes of travel rather than destination, and which particularly examine how each method of transportation effects a character’s psychology and actions. *Conveyance* was conceived to explore these themes and to share, in fictional form, the eclectic images and characters Long witnessed during his travels. Early on, this project was awarded a Virginia Commission of the Arts grant as well as writing residency fellowships at the Vermont Studio Center and at the Ucross Foundation. To date, Long has completed about seventeen stories in the collection, ten of which he has placed in journals such as *Story Quarterly*, *Indiana Review*, *Glimmer Train*, *Natural Bridge*, and *Dos Passos Review*. Two of these stories have been accepted into anthologies (*Mother Knows* [Washington Square Press, 2004] and *The Way We Work* [ed. Mary Boyes, forthcoming]), and two have been published together as a chapbook (Popular Ink Press, 2006).

**Kenneth Tompkins, Prof., Medieval and Renaissance British Literature**

Kenneth Tompkins continues to investigate various technologies and how they might be used in our classrooms. He uses weblogs and email regularly. Recently he has been thinking about using News Crawlers in his classes as a means of keeping LITT students up-to-date on what is happening in the literary world. He maintains a strong interest in bringing virtual 3D historical objects and environments into his classrooms so he continues to design and creates 3D objects. He has strong interests in narrative theory, interactive fiction, and the possibilities of producing hyperfiction from database records.

**Associated Faculty**

We continue, as much as possible, to make use of associated faculty in other programs. However, we cannot consistently rely on associated faculty to meet the needs of the Literature Program. The past five years mark significant decreases in our ability to draw from associated faculty, just as our numbers of students have steadily increased.

For instance, we lost one of our long-term associated faculty members, Linda Nelson, who moved from General Studies to SOBL and no longer has a third course to offer Literature on a regular basis. While she was generous enough to create a cross-listed ANTH/LITT course in the spring of 2006, the course attracted significantly more LITT than ANTH majors and may not be a viable option for future semesters, as it seemed not to meet the needs of her primary program. Likewise, Marion Hussong (EDUC) and Heather McGovern (GENS) had in the past each taught in the Program; however, recent administrative responsibilities and programmatic needs have prevented them from offering courses in LITT in recent years. Fred Mench, a consistent and valued associate of the Literature Program, has begun the transition to retirement, and it is uncertain how many Literature courses will be included in his replacement’s workload. Thankfully, David Roessel, Associate Professor of Greek Language and Literature, has begun to offer courses in translation aimed at Literature majors. We value the work of our associated faculty and will continue to seek their assistance in offering courses for our program.
We are fortunate to have members of the Stockton faculty that regularly contribute to the Literature program. Stephen Dunn, (Prof., poet), a member of the ARTS program, teaches primarily within LITT, and is considered a member of our core faculty. In April 2001, Professor Dunn won a Pulitzer Prize for his eleventh collection of poetry, *Different Hours*. We are fortunate to have him continue to teach one course per year, the “Advanced Poetry Workshop,” for our program.

One member of the General Studies division with background in Literature (Georgeann Lenard, Assoc. Prof., Writing) teaches selected courses within the program on a regular basis. Professor Lenard teaches lower-level Literature courses such as “Introduction to Literature” and “American Literature II,” as well 3000-level courses such as “Faulkner,” “American Naturalism,” and “The Eighteenth-Century Novel.”

**Adjunct Faculty**

Our geographical location away from Ph.D. granting institutions in Literature does not provide us with a ready pool of qualified adjuncts. However, this academic year we were fortunate to recruit Brian Kim Stefans (MFA, Brown University) to serve as a Visiting Assistant Professor of New Media Studies. Additionally, we have been fortunate to find several qualified and talented adjunct faculty members who we can rely upon to teach lower-level and/or specialized Literature courses. Lydia Fecteau, regularly teaches “Introduction to Literature” for us as a distance education course and “Disability in Literature.” Mary Steinacker, an ESL specialist, teaches our “Introduction to ESL” course. In the fall of 2005 we added a new adjunct in playwriting, Stephen Gnojewski, who is able to provide one course per year. Additionally, Maria Castillo began teaching a section of “English Language and Grammar” and Emarie DiGorgio, a former Stockton graduate with an MFA from NYU, began teaching “Introduction to Creative Writing” last fall.

As you can see, our adjuncts provide one or two courses for us each year. Thus, while adjunct faculty allow us to provide more electives, they cannot, by and large, help us with our areas of most critical need: the three-course core and advanced literature courses. We have not been able to attract qualified Ph.D.’s to teach advanced course in Literature as adjuncts, and we are reluctant to use less-qualified adjunct faculty in our foundational courses, where, according to our recent assessments, our students are being prepared for work at the upper levels and which have unique requirements in new technologies that relatively few English faculty are familiar with. In other words, our program goals and standards suggest that using adjuncts in our foundational and upper-level courses would weaken the curriculum considerably.

**Introduction to the Curriculum since 2002**

In the fall of 2006 the program implemented changes that streamlined the existing Literature curriculum and reinstated a language and culture component as a requirement for the traditional Literature major. Previously our tracks included six options:

1. Graduate School
2. Elementary Education
3. Secondary Education
4. Creative Writing
5. New Media Studies

We created the Elementary and Secondary Education tracks in response to the previous five-year reviewer’s suggestions (C.f. Josephine A. Koster’s May 2002 report).

In that report the outside reviewer noted:
1. a majority of our students were pursuing careers in teaching, and
2. those students felt underserved by the program.

Specifically, the students expressed a disconnection between their goals and the tracks they had available to them. As a result, we worked with the EDUC program and NJ guidelines to create separate tracks for elementary and secondary education, which proved to be extremely popular with students. This change expanded course tracks within our major to six individualized curriculums.

Nevertheless, soon after this six-track option was introduced, the No Child Left Behind mandate and state requirements for “Highly Qualified Teachers” suggested that there be more emphasis on content for prospective teachers and less on “Education” per se. Given these broad changes, the cumbersomeness of managing numerous tracks for over 300 majors with only seven full-time faculty, and our own discussions about the need for a language study component, we elected to create the single Literary Studies track—effectively combining the Graduate, elementary, and secondary education tracks.

Our educational goals and the curriculum requirements for those traditional Literature majors—generally students interested in graduate school or elementary and/or secondary education—are now met in one shared track: Literary Studies. Beginning in the fall of 2006, the program provides four tracks for its majors:
1. Literary Studies
2. Creative Writing
3. New Media Studies
4. Literature/Theatre.

The Creative Writing, New Media Studies, and Literature/Theatre tracks were not impacted by the 2006 change. (However, the Creative Writing track, as described below, has undergone its own changes since 2002. We also anticipate that the hiring of Brian Kim Stefans as our new tenure-track Assistant Professor of New Media Studies will also bring curricular changes to this concentration.) Besides combining tracks previously served by three separate sets of requirements, the Literary Studies track implemented another major change: a language and culture study component.

While all students benefit from foreign language and culture study, those students pursuing a traditional Literature major particularly benefit from this component. Coursework in a language other than English assists Literary Studies students’ knowledge of English while also helping to prepare them for a global workforce and richly diverse communities. We advise students interested in graduate or professional school to consider a minor or major in a foreign language as our requirements do not
meet the basic standards for most post-baccalaureate degree programs. We also encourage all of our students to consider studying abroad as a means of fulfilling part or all of the language requirement.

As the descriptions of the course requirements in each track below outline, each of the tracks prepares students for professions in the educational, business, and communication fields as well as graduate study in a range of disciplines. As a result, the curriculum continues to achieve continuity for our diverse majors, who not only have diverse career goals but also represent a range of experiences in the reading, analyzing, and writing about literature.

**The Three-Course Core**

All four tracks share a sequenced three-course core:

1. **LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies** (first semester in LITT)
2. **LITT 2123: Introduction to Research in Literature** (second semester in LITT)
3. **LITT 4610: Senior Seminar** (final semester in LITT)

This core assures all Literature students become well versed in the fundamentals of literary study and, by their senior year, have achieved full competency in our eight course goals.

“Literary Methodologies” is the first literature course taken by a student after he or she declares the major or minor. (It may be taken concurrently with other 1000-level or 2000-level Literature courses.) The course provides an intensive introduction to the requisite skills of close reading and intrinsic analysis. It also provides brief introductions to a selection of literary theories. We typically offer four or five sections of “Literary Methodologies” each academic year, two or three sections in the fall and two in the spring.

“Introduction to Research in Literature” introduces students to the evaluation and use of secondary sources (resources available in electronic and traditional library resources). Students conduct directed research in order to understand selected primary works within critical and cultural contexts. The class produces a hypertext critical annotation of a literary text. Lisa Honaker and Deborah Gussman recently adopted an optional service learning assignment that asks students to work with an area middle school. In lieu of taking an exam, the college students teach the middle school students research skills. We typically offer five sections of “Introduction to Research in Literature” each academic year, two sections in the fall and three in the spring.

“Senior Seminar” is the capstone course for most Literature majors. Faculty members select a topic for advanced study, and students apply a sophisticated critical approach to a text or texts of their choosing. A thoroughly researched twenty-five-page paper, annotated bibliography, and a presentation on the paper’s thesis comprise the course’s major projects. With permission from the faculty, Creative Writing students occasionally elect to complete a major independent study project as a replacement for Senior Seminar. Otherwise, all Literature majors complete a senior thesis that conducts literary analysis in Senior Seminar. We typically offer three sections of “Senior Seminar” each academic
year, one in the Fall semester and two sections in the Spring term.

All core courses are taught by tenured or track-track Literature faculty. We do not use adjuncts or affiliated faculty for these courses because we want to assure the faculty teaching these courses are familiar with our students and our curricular goals.

**Core Course Descriptions**

**Lit 1101: Literary Methodologies (W2)**

*Prerequisites:* None

*Course Content:* Students will be introduced to a variety of techniques for analyzing literature. They will also learn to utilize basic research and library techniques, to find evidential resources, and to synthesize their work into close reading papers. A variety of modern critical perspectives will be examined. This is a W2 (writing intensive) course.

*Attendance:* Attendance is mandatory.

*Class Format:* This class will combine lecture with class discussion.


*Papers/Projects:* Three analytical essays (one each of the three major genres: poetry, fiction, and drama) plus shorter written assignments.

*Evaluation:* Evaluation will be based on class participation and written assignments.

**LITT 2123 Introduction to Literary Research (W2)**

*Course Content:* This course introduces students to research methods within the traditional library and on the Internet.

*Prerequisites:* LITT 1101, “Literary Methodologies”

*Attendance:* Attendance is mandatory.

*Class Format:* This class will combine lecture with class discussion and with extensive library and Internet research.

*Readings:* Texts will vary from semester to semester. There will be at least one primary literary text, one text of secondary sources that pertain to the primary text, and one text on literary theory.
Papers/Projects: Group and individual research will be assigned to be done in the library and on the internet; a hypertext project, a research essay, and a PowerPoint presentation are required.

Evaluation: Evaluation will be based on class participation and written assignments.

LITT 4150 Senior Seminar (W2)

Course Content: This course serves as the major’s capstone course. It asks students to integrate close reading, literary criticism, and theory.

Prerequisites: LITT 1101, LITT 2123, Open only to Senior LITT Majors

Attendance: Attendance is mandatory.

Class Format: This class will combine lecture with class discussion and require extensive library and internet research.

Readings: Texts vary from semester to semester.

Papers/Projects: Instructors generally assign the following in addition to the final 20-30-page research paper: research paper proposal, annotated bibliography, draft of final paper (shorter paper version), teaching presentation, and an in-class presentation of the student’s research.

Evaluation: Evaluation will be based on class participation and oral and written assignments.

The Tracks

Each of the four distinct tracks (Literary Studies; New Media Studies; Literature/Theatre and Creative Writing;) includes a sequence of courses drawn from the Literature program and from other programs in the college.

Literary Studies Track

This track is designed for three, often overlapping, categories of students: those who desire a traditional English major in order to enter a variety of careers after graduation, those who wish to continue their literary studies in graduate school, and those who intend to obtain teaching certification by meeting the additional requirements of the Education program. The Literary Studies track is based on the assumption that such students need a curriculum that builds core skills in the reading, analysis, and writing about literature. Its flexibility serves the needs of our large transfer student population while also allowing faculty to teach a diverse range of courses.

In addition to the common three-course core, students must complete the following:

Any-Level Literature Courses (3 courses): 12 credits*
• LITT xxxx
• LITT xxxx
• LITT xxxx

*LITT 2143: English Language and Grammar is recommended for students planning to enter the Teacher Education program.

Upper-Level Literature Courses (4 courses): 16 credits*
• LITT 3205 Shakespeare
• LITT 3xxx or 4xxx
• LITT 3xxx or 4xxx
• LITT 3xxx or 4xxx

*At least two of these upper-level courses must focus on literature written before 1800.

Electives/Cognates (6 courses): 24 credits
• Electives: can be any additional Literature (LITT) course.
• Cognates: courses in other Arts and Humanities (ARHU) programs: the Arts (ARTV), Communication (COMM), History (HIST), Languages and Culture Studies (LANG), Philosophy (PHIL) or in closely related disciplines outside ARHU determined in consultation with program preceptor. General Studies courses will not be considered cognates.
• Language and Culture Study Component: All students must complete coursework in a language other than English sufficient to achieve proficiency at the Intermediate II level. Students hoping to gain admittance to graduate school should seriously consider taking enough courses to gain proficiency in one or more foreign languages.

Students in this track who wish to be admitted to the Teacher Education Program should apply to the Education Program in their junior year.

The New Media Studies Track
New uses of text in hypermedia demand unique skills not found in traditional communications, art, or writing programs. A logical discipline to elucidate this emerging focus on textuality is Literature.

By refocusing writing, literacy, and analytical skills more clearly on emerging modes of textuality, this track prepares students for employment in the twenty-first century. Graduates may begin careers in communications media, including public relations, advertising, and web-based enterprises. Graduates are also well situated for employment in publishing and communications, producing newsletters, e-zines, and other web-based communications. Specifically, New Media Studies students are prepared to create and manage a range of information within collaborative, hypertext environments. They are equipped to serve as web editors, team leaders, project managers, and content designers. They are also able to provide public school classrooms with creative and up-to-date technical knowledge. The New Media Studies track also prepares students to continue their graduate work at Stockton within the Masters in Arts in Instructional Technology.
(MAIT) program.

The New Media Studies Track consists of the common three-course core plus the following:

**Lower-Level Courses** (3 classes): 12 credits
- LITT 2136 Intro to New Media Studies
- ARTV 1125 The Computer as an Art Tool
- LITT 2xxx An Additional 2000-level LITT Course

**Upper-Level Courses** (7 classes): 28 credits
- LITT 3224 Hypertext
- ARTV 3621 Web Design
- LITT 3250 Multimedia Production
- LITT 3251 Internet, Writing & Society
- LITT 3xxx
- LITT 3xxx
- 4xxx Internship

**Electives/Cognates (3 classes): 12 credits**
There are 13 courses in the listing above; this leaves 3 courses as electives/cognates. The student should choose these courses after consulting with his/her preceptor.

**Theatre/English Track**
Basically, this is a double major. Students in this track study both theatre and literature. The track was created to allow theatre students to study literature and *vice-versa* and to lead, eventually, to high-school certification. It was also created to encourage students to consider careers as dramaturges.

There are two parts—each consists of thirty-two course hours.

**Literature Courses** (8 courses): 32 credits
The three-course core plus the following:
- LITT 2xxx
- LITT 3xxx Classical or Medieval Literature
- LITT 3205 Shakespeare
- LITT 3xxx 18c or 19c Literature
- LITT 3xxx 20c Literature

**Theatre Courses** (8 courses): 32 credits
- ARTP 2183 Theatre Crafts
- ARTP 2681 Acting I
- ARTP 3220 Development of Theater I
- ARTP 3221 Development of Theater II
- ARTP 3180 Directing
• ARTP Elective in Singing/Voice (2 credits)
• ARTP Elective in Dance/Movement (2 credits)

Students must also choose 2 courses from the following:
• ARTP 2282 Graphic Methods for Theater
• ARTP 2285 Lighting and Design
• ARTP 2287 Costume Design for Theatre and Dance
• ARTP 2683 Scenic Design

Students in this track should also seriously consider taking at least a year of a foreign language.

Creative Writing Track Changes Since 2002
In the spring of 2007 the program approved changes to the Creative Writing track that maintain the integrity of both the major and coursework outside the program while at the same time meeting student and program needs to draw from resources outside its disciplinary boundaries. As outlined in greater depth below, students in this track are required to take a range of literature courses and cognates as well as six creative writing courses, covering at least three genres in depth.

The Creative Writing track of Stockton’s Literature program is the second largest program track with forty-eight students enrolled in the 2006/07 academic year; enrollment in the Creative Writing track, according to Assistant Professor of Creative Writing Nathan Long, appears to be increasing in numbers. With one full time faculty member (offering three courses total for the track per year) and two part-time faculty (offering two courses total per year: “Advanced Poetry Workshop” and “Playwriting”), the program is strained to provide Creative Writing students with enough classes. Fortunately, there is help at times from associated faculty outside the program who occasionally teach “Introduction to Creative Writing,” “Writing Speculative Fiction,” and other lower level courses for this track.

To partially resolve the deficiency of Creative Writing course offerings, the program altered the track as follows:

Rather than requiring students to take two creative writing electives in LITT (such as “Hypertext,” “Form Poetry,” or “Playwriting”), which were infrequently offered and delayed students’ graduation, the track now offers Creative Writing students the option of taking two additional writing-intensive (W1) courses with a creative writing focus.

These W1 courses with a creative writing focus are selected with the help of the student’s preceptor and can be taken as “Cognates,” “General Studies,” or “At Some Distance” courses. This revision allows and encourages students to consider related courses outside the program and Division of the Arts and Humanities, such as the General Studies Non-Fiction Workshop, which is taught regularly by an MFA in General Studies. Students who take the 4-8 W1 credits option in either General Studies or At Some Distance open 4-8 LITT/Cognate credits in the Major.
The Creative Writing Track
This track is designed for the student who is interested in developing creative writing skills. Students choosing this track will work with the college’s resident and visiting writers.

In addition to the common three-course core students must complete the following:

- LITT 2237 Introduction to Creative Writing (prerequisite: C or better in a W1 course)

After taking the required lower-level core courses and at least one additional writing or literature course, students take:

- LITT 3270 Creative Writing Workshop (not repeatable)

Electives in Creative Writing (2 courses): 8 credits
Electives include but are not limited to:

- W1 Creative Writing courses in any program (selected with student’s preceptor; taken At Some Distance or in General Studies; this option opens 4-8 LITT/COGNATE elective credits)
- LITT 2160 Playwriting
- LITT 2245 Form Poetry
- LITT 3224 Hypertext
- LITT 3250 Multimedia Production

Additional Workshop Credits (2 courses): 8 credits
After completing the Creative Writing Workshop, students must take at least eight more credits of workshop:

- LITT 3636 Advanced Fiction Writing Workshop (repeatable)
- LITT 3235 Advanced Poetry Writing Workshop (repeatable)

Upper-Level Literature Courses (3 courses): 12 credits
Additionally, students must take three Literature courses at the 3000 level, one being before 1800, and one being contemporary or twentieth-century literature.

With permission of the instructor, Creative Writing students may sign up for Senior Project as a replacement for senior seminar.

The Minor
Objective: The minor in literature is designed to provide a coherent, formal, and officially recognized course of study in literature for non-literature majors, that is, for students whose primary field of study lies elsewhere but who desire to pursue study in literature for career reasons or for personal satisfaction. Literature is an integral part of the liberal arts curriculum and a literature minor provides enrichment for students in a number of disciplines, such as history, visual and performing arts, philosophy, political science, economics, pre-med, women’s studies, Holocaust studies, or Latin American studies. In addition, literature courses form core requirements for English and language
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arts teaching certification. Students interested in certification use the minor as formal recognition on their transcripts to their having completed the minimum literature requirements.

**Required Courses:** The Literature minor sets out a coherent structure while allowing for student choice. It should consist of five LITT program courses, totaling 20 credits:

- LITT 1101 (prerequisite for 3000-level courses): 4 credits
- 2 courses at the 1000 or 2000 level: 8 credits
- 2 courses at the 3000 level or above: 8 credits

**Special features** (prerequisites for courses in the minor, minimum grade requirements, etc): There are no prerequisites for the two courses taken at the 1000 or 2000 level. However, students must take LITT 1101, the only specific course required for all minors, before enrolling in courses at the 3000 level and above. LITT 1101, “Literary Methodologies,” is one of the core courses in the literature curriculum, providing necessary training in literary analysis. We require it as a prerequisite for upper-level work for our majors, and require it of our minors, so they will face no disadvantage in our 3000-level courses. Minors, like majors, must achieve grades of C or better in order to receive credit for program courses.

**Admission to the Program**
There is no special arrangement for seeking students for the program. All members of the program’s faculty participate in a rotating basis in admissions events like open houses and campus visitations.

**Curricular Assessment**
The Literature program plays an innovative role in developing and incorporating assessment strategies both in individual courses and in assessing the program as a whole. The program plans to continue to lead the college in assessment over the next five years. Deborah Gussman’s 2007 “Assessment Report for Middle States Review” notes the variety of on-going and short-term assessment activities the Literature program has been engaged with for the past several years. These assessments, as Gussman notes in her report, have been program-wide and course-specific, formal and informal.

**Formal Program-wide and Core Course Assessments**
In the past three years the program devised and conducted several formal assessments of our program and two of our core courses, specifically “Literary Methodologies” and “Senior Seminar.” We selected these two core courses as they respectively provide the major’s entry and exit courses. Under the leadership of Deborah Gussman the program also devised holistic assessment tools to gain a better understanding of our students’ perceptions of the Literature program.

**Spring 2004**
In March 2004, with the support of Sonia Gonsalves, Faculty Assessment Coordinator and Professor of Psychology at Stockton, the program conducted an assessment of Literature student satisfaction, focusing on instruction and perception of
learning. All Spring 2004 literature classes completed the survey. The assessment office conducted and scored the surveys.

The survey itself asked students to rate instruction and learning, as well as to complete a pedagogy survey. The results indicated strong satisfaction with instruction and learning at all levels. Some of the significant results can be summarized as follows:

- Female students reported their rate of learning higher than males.
- Older students rated the quality of instruction as high more often than younger students.
- Older students spent more time on schoolwork than younger students.
- Older students reported spending more time for class memorizing than younger students.
- Female students reported taking notes more often than male students.
- Older students reported working hard for class while younger students reported not working hard.
- The more interest in the subject matter, the harder the student works; the higher the reported rate of learning, the higher the rating for quality of instruction and the higher the enjoyment of the class (and visa-versa).
- Students who report the instructor uses Web Caucus often also rate the quality of instruction as high.
- Students who rate learning as high tend to report that much of the work for the course involves making notes.
- Students who report that much of the work for the course is critical thinking also tend to enjoy the class more.
- The learning activities students report learning most from (lectures, discussion) are related to analyzing information. Students who reported learning most by lecture and discussion tend to report that most of the class work involves analyzing information.
- The more the instructor lectures, the fewer classmates students know.
- Students who spend more hours on schoolwork report that much of their class involves writing papers.
- The less the group work, the less the students report that much class time is spent solving problems.
- The more the discussions, the more students report that much of the class requires listening carefully and making notes.
- Students who report working hard tend to report that the instructor uses PowerPoint presentations frequently.

Other interesting data:

- 174 students were surveyed.
- 79.9% of the students surveyed were Literature majors.
- 58.6% of the students surveyed were taking a required course.
- 59.2% of students surveyed reported learning “a lot”; 37.4 reported learning “some.”
- 51% rated instruction as “outstanding”; 42% rated instruction as “good.”
- 90% reported missing 2 or fewer classes.
Summer/Fall 2005
Starting in the summer, the Literature program began to explore the possibility of adopting a new software system called Waypoint (http://www.subjectivemetrics.com/index.cfm) for assessing writing within individual courses. Ken Tompkins arranged a meeting and demonstration by the creator of Waypoint with several members of the program and campus community in July. With the support of the college, Ken and ten other faculty members piloted the system. While the Literature faculty involved with the pilot were initially enthusiastic about the software and found it to be a valuable experience, particularly for thinking more clearly about rubrics and the sorts of responses that might be useful for many students, most decided that it was ultimately too time consuming and cumbersome to continue. Ken Tompkins also wrote an article about the Waypoint pilot for the college’s assessment newsletter, Evidence, September 2005 (http://www.stockton.edu/~teaching/evidence/evidence0905a.pdf).

Spring 2005 & 2006—“Senior Seminar”
The Literature program decided it would be useful to assess the capstone course for majors, “Senior Seminar,” to see if students were meeting faculty expectations for learning at the end of their undergraduate careers. In the Fall of 2004, Deborah Gussman consulted with Prof. Gonsalves to develop an assessment plan for the seminar she was teaching in Spring 2005. She developed a grading rubric that identified the goals and objectives for the course’s final research paper, which was reviewed and accepted by the rest of the Literature faculty. This rubric was then distributed to all of the students in the course and discussed in class. Prof. Gussman used this rubric to grade students’ final papers. After final grades were completed, each of the other full-time Literature faculty was randomly given five papers to grade using the rubric. These were completed and returned to Deborah who analyzed the data generated by this sample over the summer. Deborah published her findings in the Stockton’s assessment newsletter, Evidence, in the fall of 2005 (http://www.stockton.edu/~teaching/evidence/evidence0905a.pdf).

In brief, the assessment revealed that an overwhelming majority of our students are meeting our expectations for achievement in the major; 97% of the students received a passing grade for the course. The results also suggested that Literature faculty expectations for and grading of students were fairly consistent, as there were few discrepancies in grades, and minor disagreement over some small-scale attributes.

When the Dean of ARHU indicated that there was some funding available for assessment the following Spring, the Literature Program decided it would be a good idea to repeat the assessment of “Senior Seminar,” this time using an outside evaluator. We hoped that this would give us a sense of how our students fared with a reader unfamiliar with our particular students or student population. Dr. Holly Flint, of Penn State University, was invited to read a sample (20) of the papers from Lisa Honaker’s Spring 06 Senior Seminar on Charles Dickens. Prof. Flint used the same grading rubric from the previous assessment. She wrote a report, along with providing ideas for a revised grading rubric (c.f. Appendix I). The program was very pleased to discover that Prof. Flint’s assessment of our seniors was quite similar to our own. In her report she noted,
In response to your request that I comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the papers provided, I would first like to say that the seminar’s primary assessment strategy (which I assume was an assignment that asked students to complete an annotated bibliography followed by a 20-page research paper presenting a well-developed reading of two or more of Dickens’s works and incorporating relevant criticism and theory) is appropriate to the level of the course and ideal for guiding students through the process of developing their own voices as literary critics.

With the exception of a few cases, the papers reflect that most of those who completed the class can now lay claim to a quite thorough knowledge of Dickens’s oeuvre, an accomplishment that reflects well on both the students and the instructor. Also, based on the papers’ incorporation of secondary critical sources, most students seem to have gained and/or developed their ability to read, understand, reference, and engage literary criticism. For those students planning to enter the field of secondary education, this too seems an appropriate and laudable course goal.

Her main criticism of the papers was her sense that students privileged biographical criticism over other forms of critical inquiry. She suggested, “that they be encouraged to consider the implications of this critical assumption [authorial intention], which may occur ‘organically’ if the students were to read and cite essays written from a broader range of critical perspectives.” The program is addressing this suggestion as we construct future senior seminars, and upper level courses more generally. For example, Kristin Jacobson’s Fall 2006 “Senior Seminar” course focused on postmodern American Literature required students to construct a self-conscious theoretical lens. If our other courses sharpen students’ close reading and research skills, Prof. Jacobson saw “Senior Seminar” as an opportunity to advance students’ critical thinking through the incorporation of a clear theoretical lens. Students wrote a shorter section of their thesis paper that allowed them to practice and explore the facets of their chosen theoretical lens.

Prof. Flint was very enthusiastic about the grading rubric itself, noting that it was both effective and well constructed. The descriptions of the levels of achievement for specific areas of student performance effectively guided me through what I assume are Stockton’s standards for evaluating literature essays. As such I predict that instructors who use the rubric should be able to maintain a fairly high level of grading consistency across several dissimilar Senior Seminars.

She also made some very useful suggestions about revising the grading rubric, which were incorporated by Professor Jacobson who taught the Senior Seminar in the fall of 2006.

Spring 2006—“Literary Methodologies”
Kristin Jacobson undertook an assessment of her Literary Methodologies course at the beginning and end of the semester about key concepts as part of the Literature Program’s
review of this course. She administered two multiple-choice exams, one given at the beginning and one at the end of the term. The exams, adopted from the Norton website for the *Norton Introduction to Literature*, focused on key literary concepts and close reading techniques. The pre-test, which was not graded as part of the students’ grade for the class, clearly suggested the students needed the class. The post-test, also not a part of the students’ final grade, was less conclusive how the students benefited from the class. This exam was comprised of more difficult questions than the pre-test. As the course did not require students to memorize terms, the post-text (a different and more difficult exam than the pre-test) did not prove to be as good of an assessment tool. An examination of the students’ formal writing about literature provided a clearer indicator of student progress. The program discussed Jacobson’s findings at our summer Program retreat, and considered her suggestions in our revisions of the course for Fall 2006.

**Fall 2006 & Spring 2007—“Literary Methodologies”**

This fall, after several years of faculty discussion and pilots, the college adopted IDEA, a new instrument for student evaluations of teaching. All faculty were asked to choose one course to use with this new instrument. Those of us teaching Literary Methodologies in the fall of 2006 (Deborah Gussman, Thomas Kinsella, and Ken Tompkins) decided to have this course evaluated by students in order to have a better sense of student perceptions of and satisfaction with this first course in the core curriculum.

Prior to the course evaluation, faculty were required to identify 3-5 objectives as Important or Essential. (A sample of the Faculty Information Form (FIF) that displays all objectives is available online at http://www.idea.ksu.edu/forms/fif-form.pdf.) While the three faculty did not finally agree on all of the objectives, there was consensus on two “essential” goals: “Learning to apply course material” and “Learning to analyze and critically evaluate ideas,” and on three “minor” goals: “acquiring skill in working with others,” “Developing creative capacities,” and “Developing Personal Values.” In general, most of the variation occurred in distinguishing between “essential” and “important” goals—something that may indeed vary from instructor to instructor and may have something to do with the relative newness of this instrument and its vocabulary. Nevertheless, the process of discussing these objectives was useful in helping the faculty teaching the course to see areas of agreement and disagreement in their approach to this required course, and will be continued.

The IDEA student evaluations were distributed to the individual faculty members in January. Gussman, Kinsella, and Tompkins are currently compiling the data from their individual reports and will include the results of this assessment in the 2006/07 coordinator’s report. Additionally, in the spring of 2007 Kristin Jacobson continued her assessment of students’ prior knowledge by administering the same multiple-choice pretest of basic literary terms and close reading skills. As in the Spring 2006 semester when Jacobson administered this pretest on the first day of classes, both “Literary Methodologies” sections’ average score was between sixty-eight and sixty-nine percent. Students scored best on questions covering fiction. The majority of wrong answers appeared in sections addressing poetry and drama. The data, while it does not test writing skills, does seem to suggest that the students taking this class are appropriately placed.
Fall 2006—“Living American Poets”

In the fall of 2006, Nathan Long conducted an end of the term assessment in his “Living American Poets” course. The graph below shows students’ grades on an end of the semester test designed to measure their ability to recognize the styles and thematic content of the seven poets studied during the semester.

Table 1: Identifying Poetic Elements

The test gave students seven short excerpts of poems, one for each author studied. While the poems were in the books we read, they were not ones we discussed in class. Students had to match correctly the author (names were not provided) with the text and list three thematic or stylistic elements found in the excerpt characteristic of the author.

Six of the thirty students received an A in the assessment; fifteen received a B; seven received a C; and two received a D. In other words, twenty-one out of thirty, over two-thirds (70%), did well in identifying key poetic elements of style and theme for all seven authors, and twenty-eight of thirty (93.3%), did an acceptable job.

Fall 2006—Snapshots

The six tenured and tenure-track 2006/07 Literature faculty members collected “snapshots” focusing on the writing, technology, reading and oral communication skills incorporated into their Fall 2006 Literature courses. These snapshots provide another innovative means of program assessment. Please see the data included in “Snapshots: Literature Program Statistics and Assessment” for more details about this assessment project.

Informal Assessments

Many of the faculty in the Literature program assess their courses informally in a variety of ways, including giving “prior knowledge” quizzes early in the term, questionnaires regarding previous relevant coursework, mid-term evaluations, and end of term “post-
mortem” surveys. The faculty conduct informal assessments to increase instructor and student communication and provide “low-risk” gauges (e.g. not graded) of student knowledge and comprehension.

**Proposed Changes to the Curriculum**

From our outside reviewer the program seeks specific feedback on our current three-course core as well as recommendations about proposed changes. The program welcomes suggestions that will help us further maximize our faculty resources.

**Three-Course Core**

As noted above, the literature program recently completed a significant revision to the tracks within the major. Currently, we are examining our three core courses, with a focus on “Literary Methodologies,” to determine whether our core best meets our students’ and program’s needs.

Our reasons for re-examining the core stem from the pressure these classes put on the faculty to offer core classes in addition to other needed courses and also from a re-assessment of the need for a three-course core. Our entry course, “Literary Methodologies,” currently bears these pressures the most and, as the previous section documents, has been the focus of sustained curricular assessment and program conversation for the past year.

More detailed information about and analysis of significant statistical data pertinent to our program and teaching is included below (“Snapshots: Literature Program Numbers”), but a brief scenario here provides the context for our discussion about the core and the pressures on “Literary Methodologies” specifically. Our full-time faculty-to-Literature majors ratio (next fall this number will be 8 full-time faculty to roughly 328 majors—this number represents the number of official Fall 2006 Literature majors) makes providing enough seats in our classes and maintaining a writing intensive curriculum a challenge. If every student only took one Literature class per semester, we would be fine. Each of our Literature classes would have roughly 20 students (according to this conservative estimate of our total numbers), or nearly the current college-wide student-to-faculty ratio of 17.4:1.

\[
\frac{328 \text{ seats}}{8 \text{ faculty}} = 41 \text{ seats per faculty} / 2 \text{ LITT classes per faculty} = 20.5 \text{ seats}
\]

However, Literature majors typically need to and want to take at least two Literature classes per semester. Transfer students, for instance, often require more as they have nearly completed all of their At Some Distance (courses outside the Division), General Studies, and Cognate course requirements. Even if we conservatively double the number

---

1 The official number of 328 is a fairly conservative estimate of our actual number of majors. Briefly, this number does not account for students who are taking classes in our program but have not officially declared a Literature major and it does not account for students who have completed their B.A. requirements and are a part of the EDUC program, but who are still taking classes in the Literature program.
of seats required per semester from one to two per student, each full-time faculty member’s class size doubles from 20.5 to 41 required seats.

While these hypothetical numbers do not account for one faculty member (Professor Ken Tompkins) who serves the program with three courses per semester and our adjunct contributions, the numbers also do not account for our students seeking a Literature minor or those who take more than two literature classes in any given semester. They also do not account for students who have not officially declared a Literature major. Additionally, the numbers effectively suggest that students who wish to take a Literature course At Some Distance or as a Cognate are effectively closed off from taking those lower-level classes in the Literature program that have no prerequisite requirements. As one of the core disciplines in the Liberal Arts, Literature should be a part of (or at least a readily available option for) non-majors’ education options. Literature program courses would ideally be easily accessible for such students. While “Literary Methodologies” would be an ideal course for such exploration by non-majors, the program needs to limit enrollment to declared majors or minors.

The three required core classes, especially those that allow students entry into the 3000-Level courses, bear the brunt of the pressures our current majors-to-faculty numbers produce. One solution we are considering to reduce the bottleneck in our entry-level courses is the elimination of “Literary Methodologies.” One argument for its elimination is that our students—especially our transfer students—have already been exposed to the skills taught in this class. Rather than require this class, we might examine ways to alter existing 2000-level and 1000-level courses so they teach the close reading and genre skills covered in “Literary Methodologies.” Thus, eliminating this course could be a boon for both students and faculty: students would not take a class some consider an unnecessary repetition and both students and faculty would be able to enjoy a greater breadth of course offerings.

There are also several reasons to keep “Literary Methodologies” as a required course. While students sometime feel the course is an unnecessary repetition, our assessment methods suggest otherwise. Our students typically need more practice close reading literature, especially poetry, and expressing those ideas in writing. Furthermore, without this class, students could theoretically leave Stockton without sustained attention to all three major genres: fiction, drama, and poetry. Currently our lower-level courses are not required to address all three genres. Our concern is that while we do not have strict period requirements (e.g., we do not require American or British surveys), we do feel our students should leave the program with the ability to read and—for most of our majors—teach the major genres. “Literary Methodologies” provides such a foundation that our other courses enhance.

We have examined several possible solutions to the problems our numbers pose for our core curriculum. For example, we discussed increasing the cap in these courses. However, increasing the cap for “Literary Methodologies” proves untenable as one of the course’s fundament skills is sharpening students’ writing about literature. As a writing intensive course, the current cap of thirty to thirty-five students is already high. The same
holds true for “Senior Seminar.” Ideally, this course would be true seminar size (no more than 25 students), but more often our caps in this core course range from thirty to thirty-five students. While “Introduction to Literary Research” is not as writing intensive as our other two core course, its research projects demand student and faculty time in a different manner. Like the development of writing skills, research competency requires frequent one-on-one instruction.

Compromise: Waiving “Literary Methodologies” for Select Transfer Students

Our current compromise, begun in the spring of 2007, is to waive “Literary Methodologies” for select transfer students with significant and successful experience in Literature (e.g., three or more literature classes with a grade of B or better). We are testing this waiver as a way to reduce the bottleneck we are experiencing in our introductory core courses; however, the elimination or waiver option may simply increase the bottleneck in “Literary Research” and/or other lower-level literature courses. In other words, waiving or reducing our core requirements will not add seats, it will only allow greater flexibility. We will be working with Peter Hagen in Academic Advising to assure that the appropriate transfer students are made aware of the option to waive “Literary Methodologies.”

We may also opt to make future sections of “Literary Methodologies” permission of instructor (POI) to control enrollment in this course more closely. Tom Kinsella and Ken Tompkins regularly use POI to assure graduating seniors may register for their respective “Senior Seminar” and “Shakespeare” courses and a similar practice for “Literary Methodologies” might work as well. Additionally, to help assure Literature transfer students who need a seat in “Literary Methodologies” can find one, we will also continue a practice begun this Spring where at least five seats in each section are reserved for transfer students. These reserved seats do not open until the day when Spring transfer students register.

Current Status of Core Assessment: Any Changes Should Reflect Pedagogical Goals

We will continue to study our core curriculum by weighing the costs and benefits of any proposed changes for our students. For example, as part of our on-going assessment we hope to be able to track the number of transfer students granted waivers for “Literary Methodologies” through the College’s new Banner system.

The program currently agrees that both “Literary Methodologies” and “Literary Research” will remain core courses, and we are also reluctant to eliminate “Senior Seminar” as a requirement, although it presents a similar bottleneck problem at the end of a student’s education at Stockton. At present, the focused attention to research skills and the production of a senior thesis that these two courses provide remain indispensable for the achievement of our seven program goals. There may be ways to alter “Literary Research” so that it covers close reading of the genres as well as research methods. However, as long as our primary motivation for changing the core reflects a reaction to our student numbers and the pressure they put on these entry and exit courses to the major, we are reluctant to change the curriculum. Such changes, if or when they are made, should reflect clear pedagogical goals and the learning needs of our students.
New Media Studies—Proposed Changes to the Track
The hiring of a new assistant professor of New Media Studies combined with the innovative nature of the field will likely bring adjustments to this concentration over the next five years. The Literature program will provide the new faculty member with both the freedom and guidance to make necessary changes to this track’s curriculum.

Our national search for this faculty member concluded in February 2007. We are pleased to welcome Brian Stefans as the new assistant professor of New Media Studies. Prof. Stefans has already begun conversations with the program about potential changes to the concentration and how this track may better serve and attract students.

Multi-Ethnic Literatures of the United States—Increased Course Offerings
The hiring of a new assistant professor of Multi-Ethnic Literatures of the United States will also add to our course offerings in areas such as African American and Chicano/a literatures. This new faculty member will have the opportunity to add new courses in his or her specialty area(s) as well as design an introductory survey course in U.S. multi-ethnic literatures.

Timeline for Changes
The Program plans to revisit the proposed changes to the curriculum in the Spring 2007 semester and during our summer retreat after we receive our outside reviewer’s report. Should the program adopt changes to the current curriculum, they would likely be enacted for the 2007/08 academic year or later. In the meantime, as part of our on-going core assessment process, we have begun to allow appropriate coursework for our more advanced transfer students to count as “Literary Methodologies.”

Snapshots: Literature Program Statistics and Assessment
While other programs at Stockton also have a large number of majors, we hope the following snapshots focusing on writing, technology, reading, and oral communication craft compelling evidence of and arguments for our program’s specific requirements, especially in regard to the simultaneous need for both more and smaller classes. As outlined in the “Long-Range Planning” section, to meet demand while maintaining the integrity of our writing, reading, and technology enhanced literature instruction, we need administrative support of and commitment to additional tenure-track faculty lines.

A series of numbers, charts, and graphs with analysis follow. This section provides various snapshots of the Literature Program that outline the challenges and successes that have emerged over the past five years.

Majors to Full-Time Faculty Ratio
We have been noting for several years with both qualitative and quantitative data that the demand for courses in Literature continues to grow. In the spring of 2002 (during our last self-study), for example, we had 178 majors. As of the Fall 2006 semester, there were 328 declared Literature majors and our Spring 2007 numbers list 334 majors.
Since our last self-study the number of students in our program has grown by nearly fifty percent. We nearly have double the number of majors we did five years ago (Spring 2002, 178 majors; Spring 2007, 334 majors). Our faculty numbers, however, have not increased at the same rate to meet this added demand. In March of 2002 there were six full-time faculty members. In September of 2007 there will be 8 full-time faculty members, an increase of only about thirty-three percent.

**Deceptive Numbers: A Conservative Estimate of Our Majors**

Furthermore, as we noted in the previous section, our number of declared majors represents a conservative estimate of the actual number of students served by the program. The number of declared majors does not account for our minors, students who intend to declare a major but have not, and any non-majors who take Literature courses as Cognates or At Some Distance as part of their curriculum. Additionally, this number does not account for students who have completed their B.A. and are now a part of the EDUC program, but who still may be completing some coursework and/or seek advising from the Literature program. Program faculty estimate our actual number of majors to be closer to 350 students.
As a result, the Literature program is regularly unable to meet the college’s coveted 17.4:1 student-to-faculty ratio in its courses and in its precepting duties, two key elements to providing the highest quality liberal arts education. Should our numbers not increase again next year, our major-to-full time faculty ratio will be about forty-one declared majors for every one full-time faculty member.
Reasons for Rapid Growth

As noted in previous coordinator’s reports, at least some of the Literature program’s increased demand can be attributed to changes in national and New Jersey teacher certification requirements. The new requirements, such as the “Highly Qualified Teacher” model adopted by NJ in response to the No Child Left Behind act, place greater emphasis on content-based knowledge. Since the implementation of the “Highly Qualified Teacher” model, we are seeing more Literature majors with a desire to teach elementary and secondary education. Some increased demand may also be attributed to the demographic shift that is occurring as the children of the baby-boomer generation attend college in large numbers, thus swelling enrollment at the state and national levels for the foreseeable future. The Literature Program also attracts students. We pride ourselves in providing a quality, personalized education for our majors. The outreach and social activities provided by the program combined with the innovative teaching methods described below and in other sections attract students to our program.

As discussed in greater detail in the section, “Long-Range Planning,” the Literature program would like to see the State and the College provide more support to the higher education programs that are impacted by State and national changes and charged with training future teachers. One means to provide this support is through new lines for tenure-track faculty hires.

Average Class Size

Another way to understand the growth we have experienced is to compare our average class size in 1997 to our 2005 numbers. According to the “Undergraduate Class/Nonclass Courses” data available from Stockton’s Institutional Research page, in 1997 our average class size in the Spring term was 12, and by 2005 our average class size was 26. Our average class size has grown over fifty-percent in the past eight years. Again, our program faculty growth does not match or keep pace with this rate.

---

3 According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in October 2004, 66.7 percent of high school graduates from the class of 2004 were enrolled in colleges or universities. The college enrollment rate for recent high school graduates was almost 3 percentage points higher than a year earlier and approached this historical high of 67.0 percent (in 1997). (Source: U.S. Department of Labor, March 2005. http://www.bis.gov/news.release/hsgec.nr0.htm)
4 All data taken from Stockton’s Institutional Research website, “Undergraduate Class/Nonclass Courses” (http://intraweb.stockton.edu/eyos/page.cfm?siteID=54&pageID=7).
When we compare our average class size to other programs in the Arts and Humanities, we find no other program in the Division has experienced more growth in average class size from 1997 to 2005. Additionally, the Literature Program has the largest average class size for 2005: 25. Communication and Philosophy both have an average class size of 23, followed by History at 21.

Table 6: Average ARHU Class Size by Program (Spring Terms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTV</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANG</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we broaden this comparison and look across the College, we see Anthropology experienced the largest increase in average class size during this same period, moving from an average class size of 23 to 37, an increase of about sixty-one percent to an already large average class size. At 37, Anthropology also has the largest average class size for 2005. Other programs across the College with larger 2005 average class sizes than Literature include GNM (29), ACCT (26), BSNS (26), FINA (28). Significantly, as our snapshots about writing, technology and reading demonstrate, other programs with large average class sizes (such as Accounting, Business, and Finance) are likely not as writing and reading intensive as the Literature program.
Table 7: Average Class Size (Spring Terms) 1997-2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITT</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTV</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANG</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASK</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAH</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNM</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCMB</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOL</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCT</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSNS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIS</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOSP</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGMT</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKTG</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHTH</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAW</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBH</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTH</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIM</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERO</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWK</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison with Area Colleges’ English/Literature Programs

In addition to Stockton’s own student-to-faculty ratio, a key piece of data that helps assess the status and needs of our program comes from other area colleges. A brief overview of other Literature programs emphasizes the degree to which Stockton’s Literature Program lags behind those in its region in terms of its number of faculty.5

Table 8: LITT Program Comparison Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>LITT Faculty</th>
<th>LITT Majors</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stockton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of NJ</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJ City Univ</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>3916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>8430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew Univ</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryn Mawr</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lycoming</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Stockton LITT Program Numbers in Comparison

5 College, department, and—where available—institutional research WebPages provided the data for the colleges and universities. All data was obtained in December 2006.
Strikingly, Stockton currently has the same number of faculty members as Lycoming College (seven). Lycoming, however, has only 1500 undergraduates compared with Stockton’s 7000. The College of New Jersey, which boasts 305 English and English-Education majors, has triple the program faculty. The College of New Jersey has twenty-eight full-time English faculty members and Stockton’s Literature program has only seven.

Table 10: Program Comparison Details

Richard Stockton College of New Jersey
- Name of major/degree: Literature
- Number of program faculty: 7
- Number of Majors: 328
- Total number of full-time faculty: 253
- Total number of undergraduates: 7,000

College of New Jersey
- Name of major/degree: English/English Teaching
- Number of program faculty: 26
- Number of Majors: 305
- Total number of full-time faculty: 341
- Total number of undergraduates: 6,000

New Jersey City University
- Name of major/degree: English
- Number of program faculty: 33
- Number of Majors: 196
- Total number of faculty: 237
- Total number of undergraduates: 3916

Drew University
- Name of major/degree: English/Literature
- Number of program faculty: 14 Graduate & Undergraduate; 30 Part-Time Faculty
- Number of majors: n/a; B.A. English Degrees Awarded (AY 2006): 47
- Total number of faculty: 155
- Total number of undergraduates:

1,656

Bryn Mawr College
- Name of major/degree: English
- Number of program faculty: 14
- Total number of full-time faculty: 159
- Total number of undergraduates: 1,378

Lycoming College
- Name of major/degree: English
- Number of program faculty: 7
- Number of majors: n/a
- Total number of full-time faculty: 90
- Total number of undergraduates: 1,500

Rowan University
- Name of major/degree: English
  (College of Communications houses the Writing and Creative Writing Programs)
- Number of program faculty: 10
- Number of Majors: 292
- Total number of full-time faculty: 451
- Total number of undergraduates: 8,430
Graduation Statistics

Besides looking at our number of total majors and comparing it with other programs, another way to understand the rapid increase of students into the Literature program is to study our graduation statistics. The Literature program proudly reports a large number of graduates and high retention rates.

Table 11: Graduation Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>LITT graduates</th>
<th>ARHU graduates</th>
<th>College graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-93</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993-94</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-95</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-96</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>1456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The graph above representing the following numbers:

Table 12: Graduation Statistics Chart
As the graph and chart illustrate, the past few years of Literature graduates mark the steady rise in our numbers. When looking at the graph below, it is key to remember that Communications and Language were still part of Literature program from 1990-96, and that Language was still part of Literature program from 1997-98. The initial decline in our numbers following the separation of these three programs has ceased; the Literature Program has now surpassed the enrollment numbers reported when the three programs were combined.

Table 13: Literature Graduates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Literature Graduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program enrollments have steadily increased after splits from Communications (COMM), which established its own freestanding program in 1996 and began to draw majors in 1997, and Language (LANG), who established its own program in 1998. Indeed, Literature is now the largest program in the Division of the Arts and Humanities.

Retention Rates Among 2000 Cohort of First-Time, Full-Time First-Year Students

While our numbers have posed challenges to our teaching and advising, our retention rates among new, full-time, first-year students remain strong. As the graphs below indicate, in the fall of 2000 we began with eighteen declared English majors among the 2000 cohort. Our numbers lowered to ten among this cohort in the fall of 2001, perhaps reflective of students who are still exploring
career and educational paths in their freshman and sophomore years. Unfortunately, our lowered numbers may also represent student frustration: first and second year students are among the last to register for courses and due to our increase in numbers, juniors and seniors have the best program course selection as they register for courses first.

Table 14: Cohort Literature Program Retention Rates

![2000 Cohort Literature Program Retention Rates](image)

Significantly, while our numbers dropped between the first and second years, we retained fifteen students from this original cohort of students through the junior and senior years (Fall 2002 and 2003). Thus, where the college-wide retention rates decreased to seventy-two and sixty-seven percent during the fall of 2002 and 2003 respectively, the Literature program retention rates remained high at eighty-three percent during both years. While both the college-wide and Literature retention rates dropped significantly in the ninth and eleventh semesters, the Literature program rates remained among the highest in the college and overall percentage.
We feel these high retention rates among juniors and seniors reflect our strong teaching and our ability to keep the program personal and well suited for our majors’ career and educational goals. One advantage to our small faculty is the ability to work with students over several semesters. Frequently, we know our students’ weaknesses and strengths not only in a general sense in terms of what we observe and assess from semester-to-semester but also from observing the individual student’s progress, tracked from their freshman through senior years.

Five Year Trends

Table 16: Literature Declared/Intended Majors by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female majors remain in the majority. Over the past five years our number of female majors has increased from 69.9% to 73.7%. Overall, however, our number of female majors has decreased since its high of 75.6% in the fall of 2003. As a large number of our students pursue careers in education, it is important to note that our numbers are consistent with those national averages. In
2004 the U.S. Census Bureau reported 71% of all teachers were female and 79% of elementary and middle school teachers were female.  

Table 17: Literature Declared/Intended Majors by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Am</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI/AN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/PI</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our program numbers are fairly consistent with college-wide statistics and national trends for Literature programs. In the fall of 2005, for example, the College reported, “Minority student enrollment remains consistent with previous years at 18% undergraduate enrollment (8% Black, 6% Hispanic, and 4% Asian).” The challenges outlined by Bettina J. Huber in the 1990 Association of Departments in English (ADE) article, “Incorporating Minorities into English Programs: The Challenge of the Nineties” remain largely true for the early twenty-first century. The program remains committed to recruiting minority students and providing a supportive environment. While minority scholars are sometimes difficult to recruit to a campus and program of our size and teaching load, we hope to diversify our program faculty with new hires that would help support our mentoring and recruitment efforts.

Table 18: Literature Declared/Intended Majors by Attendance Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance Status</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FT</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One significant change over the past five years is the increase in full-time majors from 84.3% in the fall of 2001 to 92.7% in the fall of 2005. Anecdotal evidence gathered from working with our students suggests, however, many continue to work full-time. Thus, while more of our students are going to school full-time, they are also often working full- or part-time jobs in addition to a full course load. The feature of our undergraduates has both costs and benefits. Some students encounter serious time management difficulties, but the “real world” experiences of our students adds another level of diversity to our classrooms.

---


Table 19: Literature Declared/Intended Majors by Class Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Level</th>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jr</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching Additional Literature Instead of General Studies Courses

As a short-term solution to our increase in majors the Literature program, in consultation with the Dean of Arts and Humanities, began substituting additional Literature courses for some tenured faculty members in the fall of 2005. Instead of their usual G-course requirement, these faculty members would teach three program courses in one term. In the Spring 06 term, for example, the large number of Seniors needing to take “Senior Seminar” in order to graduate on time required us to add an additional section of the course. Had we not added the additional section, students would have been forced to delay their graduation by one semester. As a result, Lisa Honaker dropped her GEN “Rhetoric and Composition” course. Then, after the preceptorial advising period in the spring of 2006, it became apparent that there were not a sufficient number of seats at the 3000-level to meet student demand. Deborah Gussman cancelled her GEN course, and added another 3000-level LITT course.

The Literature program does not see this as a tenable long-term solution to our needs. All of the Literature faculty are committed to teaching in General Studies. Moreover, the ad hoc adding and canceling of courses is not good for the programs in Literature or General Studies, Literature or General Studies faculty, or our students.

Courses Offered by Tenured/Tenure-Track Literature Faculty

The core Literature faculty offer a variety of upper and lower level program and General Studies courses. Generally, faculty members contribute two classes per term to the Literature program and one course to General Studies. Over the past five years additional tenure-track faculty lines have added to our course offerings in new media studies, creative writing, and contemporary American literature. Over the past two years we have been able to offer between thirteen and sixteen sections per academic term while simultaneously increasing our summer offerings. The chart below demonstrates the range and number of classes tenured or tenure-track Literature faculty offered our Literature students from the fall of 2001 until the spring of 2007.

Table 20: Core Literature Faculty LITT Courses F01-S07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LITT Course</th>
<th>F01</th>
<th>S02</th>
<th>F02</th>
<th>S03</th>
<th>s03</th>
<th>F03</th>
<th>S04</th>
<th>s04</th>
<th>F04</th>
<th>S05</th>
<th>s05</th>
<th>F05</th>
<th>S06</th>
<th>s06</th>
<th>F06</th>
<th>S07</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITT 1100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 1101</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 1104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Column 1</td>
<td>Column 2</td>
<td>Column 3</td>
<td>Column 4</td>
<td>Column 5</td>
<td>Column 6</td>
<td>Column 7</td>
<td>Column 8</td>
<td>Column 9</td>
<td>Column 10</td>
<td>Column 11</td>
<td>Column 12</td>
<td>Column 13</td>
<td>Column 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2109</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2120</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2124</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2131</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2136</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2145</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2412</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3205</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3208</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3216</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3217</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3223</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3224</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3235</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3250</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3261</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3615</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3681</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 4610</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 9 7 11 11 2 10 12 2 11 10 4 14 15 3 14 13 148
This chart demonstrates the significant role the core courses play in our teaching. Out of the 148 total sections offered from Fall 2001-Spring 2007:

- 25 sections = LITT 1101 (“Literary Methodologies”),
- 22 sections = LITT 2123 (“Introduction to Literary Research”), and
- 13 sections = LITT 4110 (“Senior Seminar”).

While associated and adjunct faculty also contributed important classes over the past five years, the above chart outlines what the core Literature faculty has offered as well as when they were able to offer these courses. The chart also serves as a predictor of what the program faculty can be expected to offer in the future.

The next set of charts lists the courses offered by individual tenured and tenure-track faculty over the past five years.

Deborah Gussman’s LITT Course Offerings

Fall 2001
- LITT 2131: The Great American Novel
- LITT 3621: Early American Literature

Spring 2002
- LITT 2109: Contemporary American Fiction
- LITT 3210: American Romanticism

Fall 2002
- LITT 1104: Introduction to Literature by Women
- LITT 4610: Senior Seminar

Spring 2003
- LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies
- LITT 3208: Native American Literature

Fall 2003
- LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies
- LITT 3311: American Women Writers

Spring 2004
- LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies
- LITT 2401: Survey of American Literature I

Fall 2004
- LITT 2123: Introduction to Research in Literature
- LITT 2140: Literature by Women

Lisa Honaker’s LITT Course Offerings

**Fall 2001**
- LITT 1100: Introduction to Literature
- LITT 2123: Introduction to Research in Literature

**Spring 2002**
- LITT 2123: Introduction to Research in Literature (2 sections)

**Fall 2002**
- LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies
- LITT 3681: Modern British Novel

**Spring 2003**
- LITT 3615: Victorian Literature
- LITT 4610: Senior Seminar (Novels into Films)

**Fall 2003**
- LITT 2123: Introduction to Research in Literature (2 sections)

**Spring 2004**
- LITT 2123: Introduction to Research in Literature (2 sections)

**Summer 2004**
- LITT 3220: British Romantics

**Fall 2004**
- LITT 2103: British Literature II
- LITT 3221: British Women Writers

**Spring 2005**
- LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies
- LITT 3223: Contemporary British Fiction

**Summer 2005**
- LITT 3220: British Romantics

**Fall 2005**
- LITT 2120: Detective Fiction
- LITT 3618: Modern British Novel

**Spring 2006**
- LITT 2123: Introduction to Research in Literature
- LITT 4610: Senior Seminar (Charles Dickens) (2 sections)

**Summer 2006**
- LITT 2120: Detective Fiction
- LITT 3220: British Romantics (2 sections)

**Fall 2006**
- LITT 2123: Introduction to Research in Literature (2 sections)

**Spring 2007**
- LITT 2123: Introduction to Research in Literature
- LITT 3615: Victorian Literature

---

### Kristin Jacobson’s LITT Course Offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2105: American Literature II</td>
<td>LITT 2145: Domestic Dramas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3217: Special Topics in American Literature (Domestic Fiction)</td>
<td>LITT 4610: Senior Seminar (Postmodern American Fiction)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2006</th>
<th>Spring 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies</td>
<td>LITT 1101 Literary Methodologies (2 sections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2109: Contemporary American Fiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tom Kinsella’s LITT Course Offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2001</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies</td>
<td>LITT 3230: Restoration and 18th Century British Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 4610: Senior Seminar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2002: Sabbatical</th>
<th>Spring 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2123: Introduction to Literary Research (2 sections)</td>
<td>LITT 2123: Introduction to Literary Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2002</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2123: Introduction to Literary Research (2 sections)</td>
<td>LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 2124: Readers, Writers, and Books</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2003</th>
<th>Spring 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2123: Introduction to Literary Research (2 sections)</td>
<td>LITT 2123: Introduction to Literary Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 2412: English Language &amp; Grammar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer 2003</th>
<th>Summer 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2412: English Language &amp; Grammar (2 sections)</td>
<td>LITT 2412: English Language &amp; Grammar (2 sections)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2003</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2102: British Literature I</td>
<td>LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 4610: Senior Seminar</td>
<td>LITT 2124: Readers, Writers, and Books</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spring 2004</th>
<th>Spring 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2412: English Language &amp; Grammar</td>
<td>LITT 2123: Introduction to Literary Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT 3106: Milton</td>
<td>LITT 2412: English Language &amp; Grammar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer 2004</th>
<th>Summer 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2412: English Language &amp; Grammar</td>
<td>LITT 2412: English Language &amp; Grammar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall 2004</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITT 2123: Introduction to Literary Research</td>
<td>LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 3229: Restoration &amp; 18th-Century Drama</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Additional Information

10 A digital archive of Prof. Kinsella’s classes is available: [http://loki.stockton.edu/~kinsellt/coursesyll/kinsellasyllabi20012006.html](http://loki.stockton.edu/~kinsellt/coursesyll/kinsellasyllabi20012006.html)
Nathan Long’s LITT Course Offerings
Fall 2005
LITT 2237: Introduction to Creative Writing
LITT 2637: Creative Writing Workshop (now LITT 3270)

Spring 2006
LITT 2237: Introduction to Creative Writing
LITT 3636: Advanced Fiction Writing Workshop

Fall 2006
LITT 2637: Creative Writing Workshop (now LITT 3270)
LITT 3242: Living American Poets

Spring 2007
LITT 3270: Creative Writing Workshop
LITT 3636: Advance Fiction Writing Workshop

Scott Rettburg’s LITT Course Offerings
Fall 2002
LITT 2136: New Media Studies
LITT 2137: Hypertext

Spring 2003
LITT 2136: New Media Studies
LITT 3250: Multimedia Production

Fall 2003
LITT 2136: New Media Studies

Spring 2004
LITT 3224: Hypertext
LITT 3251: Internet, Writing, and Society
LITT 4610: Senior Seminar (Postmodernism)

Fall 2004
LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies
LITT 3250: Multimedia Production

Spring 2005
LITT 2136: New Media Studies
LITT 3224: Hypertext

Fall 2005
LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies
LITT 3250: Multimedia Production

Spring 2006
LITT 2136: New Media Studies
LITT 3224: Hypertext

11 An electronic archive of Scott Rettburg’s classes is available at http://caxton.stockton.edu/rettberg/stories/storyReader$98.
Ken Tompkins’ LITT Course Offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Course Offerings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
<td>LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 3110: Chaucer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 3205: Shakespeare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 3205: Shakespeare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 4610: Senior Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2002</td>
<td>LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 3235: Renaissance English Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 4610: Senior Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
<td>LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 2133: The Search for the Grail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 3205: Shakespeare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 3205: Shakespeare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 3261: Medieval English Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2003</td>
<td>LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 3235: Renaissance English Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 3205: Shakespeare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 325: Renaissance English Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
<td>LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 3205: Shakespeare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 3261: Medieval English Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 3205: Shakespeare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 2133: The Search for the Grail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2004</td>
<td>LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 2133: Search For the Grail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 3216: Advanced Shakespeare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spring 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 2138: Delivering Content: Voices/Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 3110: Chaucer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LITT 3205: Shakespeare</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summer Courses
The Literature program’s last outsider reviewer suggested we increase our Summer course offerings. As the summer provides our junior faculty with the only extended time to work on their research and writing (no release time is available for junior faculty unless they apply for and receive an outside fellowship), the program does not encourage junior faculty to teach summer courses. As a result, tenured and adjunct faculty—who also need the summer for research projects—meet our demand for summer classes. They do so through both traditional, on-campus and distance-learning courses. Since our last self-study, the program has increased its summer offerings from zero in the Summer of 2001 to the following full-time equivalency (FTE) numbers in the Summers of 2005 and 2006:

Table 21: LITT Summer FTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer 2005, FTE</th>
<th>Summer 2006, FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITT:</td>
<td>LITT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARHU:</td>
<td>ARHU:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Undergraduate: 1997</td>
<td>Total Undergraduate: 2052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Literature program increased its FTE by about thirty-four percent from the Summer of 2005 to the Summer of 2006. Tenured faculty in the Literature program remained committed to teaching summer courses for our students while recognizing that they, too, require focused time during the summer to complete research and other scholarly and professional activities. Despite these increases, our majors frequently request more summer course offerings; should we be able to offer more summer courses, they would certainly fill.
Faculty and Program Curriculum Snapshots

Writing, technology, reading, and oral communication represent four key skill sets that the Literature Program teaches its students. The following charts represent snapshots of the instruction we are conducting in these four areas. While difficult to quantify, these skills demand additional instruction time, both in terms of preparation and grading time. Thus, these curriculum snapshots and the following section dedicated to precepting begin to illustrate the large amount of time Literature faculty spend out of the classroom and above and beyond normal office hours teaching and evaluating student writing, training, preparing, and instructing students and themselves in technological literacies, and advising students in coursework and career paths.

Focus on Writing

The following charts represent the significant amount of writing the full-time, tenured or tenure-track Literature faculty assign and evaluate in one semester. Taken from our Fall 2006 Literature classes, this “snapshot” or “Focus on Writing” aims to demonstrate the program’s dedication to a writing intensive curriculum and to the college’s writing across the curriculum initiative. While quantity of pages does not necessarily equate with quality of instruction or the quality of writing produced, we believe these collective numbers help assess our commitment to teaching written communication skills; they also provide an overview of the typical amount of writing a Literature major may compose and a literature faculty member may assign and evaluate in a given semester.

Table 22: Gussman LITT Fall 06, Substantive Written Assignments Taught:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th># of Assignments</th>
<th>Average Pages</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compare/Contrast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midterm Essay Exam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Essay Exam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researched Essay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Essay Exam</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OED Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drama Analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Reading (poetry)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Reading (fiction)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Pages** 1445

Total LITT Students (3 Sections) 85
Average Number of Pages Per Student 17

**Estimated Faculty Reading Hours** 84.29166667
Table 23: Honaker LITT Fall 06, Substantive Written Assignments Taught:

Fall 06 LITT Courses:  
- LITT 2123 “Introduction to Literary Research”
- LITT 2123 “Introduction to Literary Research”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th># of Assignments</th>
<th>Average Pages</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scholarship Essay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Pages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>506</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total LITT Students (2 Sections)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Pages Per Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Faculty Reading Hours: 29.51666667

Table 24: Jacobson LITT Fall 06, Substantive Written Assignments Taught:

Fall 06 LITT Courses:  
- LITT 2145 “Domestic Dramas” (27 Students)
- LITT 4610 “Senior Seminar” (31 Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th># of Assignments</th>
<th>Average Pages</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading Journal</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play Review</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Research Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminar Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>697.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Pages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2255</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total LITT Students (2 Sections)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Number of Pages Per Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.87931034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimated Faculty Reading Hours: 131.5416667

Table 25: Kinsella LITT Fall 06, Substantive Written Assignments Taught:

Fall 06 LITT Courses:  
- LITT 1101 “Literary Methodologies”
- LITT 3229 “Restoration and Early Eighteenth-Century Drama”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th># of Assignments</th>
<th>Average Pages</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reaction Paper 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction Paper 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OED Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>148.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned Essay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Web Essay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>214.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Essay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Pages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1749</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total LITT Students (2 Sections)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Average Number of Pages Per Student

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Faculty Reading Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 26: Long LITT Fall 06, Substantive Written Assignments Taught:

**Fall 06 LITT Courses:**
- LITT 2637: Creative Writing workshop (15 students)
- LITT 3242: Living American Poets (30 students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th># of Assignments</th>
<th>Average Pages</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing/Revision</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Papers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Answer Tests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Pages</strong></td>
<td><strong>2160</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total LITT Students (2 Sections)</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Number of Pages Per Student</strong></td>
<td><strong>48</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Faculty Reading Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 27: Tompkins LITT Fall 06, Substantive Written Assignments Taught:

**Fall 06 LITT Courses:**
- LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies
- LITT 1102: Shakespeare
- LITT 3242: Search for the Grail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th># of Assignments</th>
<th>Average Pages</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OED Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetry Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiction Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Paper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Pages</strong></td>
<td><strong>1927.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total LITT Students (3 Sections)</strong></td>
<td><strong>86</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Number of Pages Per Student</strong></td>
<td><strong>22.4127907</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Faculty Reading Hours</strong></td>
<td><strong>112.4375</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When preparing to read at conferences, presenters are frequently reminded that it takes approximately two minutes to read one page of typed text. Given that faculty members not only read but comment on the text as they read, it conservatively takes approximately three-to-four minutes to read one page of student writing. Thus, the numbers above
represent at least 585 reading hours by the core faculty during one semester to evaluate student writing.

Table 28: Summary of Substantive Written Assignments Taught Fall 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Total Pages</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gussman</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>84.29166667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honaker</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>29.51666667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobson</td>
<td>2255</td>
<td>131.54166667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsella</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>102.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tompkins</td>
<td>1927.5</td>
<td>112.4375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total LITT</strong></td>
<td><strong>10042.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>585.8125</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of Fall 06 LITT students taught by core faculty: 386

The Literature program understands the data collected on our writing instruction to demonstrate clearly that, despite our large number of majors, we are assigning written work equivalent to smaller, seminar-type classes. For example, an average student during the Fall 06 semester wrote about thirty pages in our Literature classes.

10042.5 total pages/ 386 total students = 27.3 pages per student

Smaller classes for the most writing intensive courses (such as Senior Seminar) are an ideal we would like to move toward in the next five years. Smaller classes would increase one-on-one instruction opportunities and reduce faculty evaluation hours, freeing more time for the faculty’s own research and writing.

**Focus on Technology**

A commitment to technology is a commitment to life-long learning. As a discipline and method that undergoes rapid change, technological literacy requires on-going dedication to learn new skills as well as update skills. The Literature program recognizes this type of literacy as key to modern career paths specifically and contemporary life broadly. Thus, the program developed the track in New Media Studies and enhances the core and elective coursework with electronic technologies.

It is safe to claim that the Literature Program is the most technological savvy program at Stockton. It is also true that we have been technologically savvy for over a decade. This is due, in large part, because the program has been willing to experiment with new technologies in our classrooms, because we were very early adapters of computers in our academic lives and because we believe that Literature majors ought to be in the front-lines of advocating educational technologies.

Briefly, we have used conferencing software (mid-1980s), weblogs (late 1990s), wikis (2004), MOOs and MUDs (early 1980s), podcasting (2004) and digital papers (late
1990s). Much of the time we have been very early adopters of these technologies. For example, we required all LITT majors to have weblogs in 2000–2001. Most English departments did not know they existed then. Before we started using weblogs, LITT majors were required to create a web page and we taught HTML and FTP-ing to make that possible.

Most of these technologies were used to build classroom community, to offer round-the-clock environments for discussion, for virtual office hours, for creating portfolios of their work, and for understanding the changes that are happening in the definitions of text and textualities.

We are proud of these efforts and will continue to implement whatever available technologies prove to be effective in the classroom. This last point is our sole criterion for considering adoption. There have been times when we were not sure of classroom effectiveness – so new was the technology we were considering. But if it did not prove effective, we abandoned it fairly quickly.

What follows is a brief snapshot of one semester’s work in instructional technologies.

**Gussman LITT Fall 06, Technology in the Classroom Snapshot**

All of Prof. Gussman’s Fall 2006 classes were taught in “smart” classrooms and made use of Internet and computer projection capabilities.

**American Drama/LITT 3240**
- Course syllabus available on-line (http://caxton.stockton.edu/bookish/stories/storyReader$119)
- WebCaucus used for conferencing, posting links of related course materials, secondary readings, websites, pictures
- Clips from films and videos of performances shown in class
- Students used PowerPoint, film clips, music to develop in-class performances

**American Romanticism/LITT 3210**
- Course syllabus available on-line (http://caxton.stockton.edu/bookish/stories/storyReader$121)
- PowerPoint used for student presentations of secondary source materials.

**Literary Methodologies/LITT 1101**
- Course weblog, Litmeth123, for syllabus, course materials, assignments, announcements (http://caxton.stockton.edu/Litmeth123/)
- Students created individual weblogs for final poetry project, which included a close reading of a poem, an image gallery, and a link to or transcription of the poem (http://caxton.stockton.edu/Litmeth123/discuss/msgReader$14)
• WebCaucus used for conferencing, posting links of related course materials including secondary readings, websites, pictures

Gussman LITT Technology Overview

Me and My Technology: A Haiku
by Deb Gussman

I build things with blogs
They are versatile and fun
Like water and sand.

Most of Prof. Gussman’s technology use in the classroom centers on weblogs and web-conferencing. She uses weblogs for a variety of purposes:

• Interactive syllabi and course information in “Literary Methodologies,” “Introduction to Literary Research,” and the “American Short Story”: examples include:
  o http://caxton.stockton.edu/litmeth123/
  o http://caxton.stockton.edu/bookish/stories/storyReader$99

• Student portfolios: some examples from “Literary Methodologies”:
  o http://caxton.stockton.edu/quixotic/
  o http://caxton.stockton.edu/quenzelsquest/

• Various class projects, including:
  o Group novels: http://caxton.stockton.edu/noveljordan/
  o Hypertext annotation projects: http://caxton.stockton.edu/mumbet/
  o The American Short Story Project: a collection of student-created weblogs focused on individual American short stories—
    http://134.210.115.43/DJG07LITT2143/
  o Poem Pages: student created weblogs focused on individual poems, such as:
    ▪ Kipling’s “The Vampire”
      http://caxton.stockton.edu/LegoreTrout/stories/storyReader$20
    ▪ Melville’s “Shiloh”
      http://caxton.stockton.edu/adops/stories/storyReader$14

Prof. Gussman also uses web-conferencing, primarily Web Caucus, in all of her classes for posting announcements, information and links related to course materials, for informal writing assignments such as responses to discussion questions, and occasionally to further develop an issue that was raised in class that either she did not know the answer to or that we did not have time to complete, or that was interesting but tangential.
She also uses Web Caucus as the main site for her distance course on “The American Short Story.” Here, she posts and students respond to weekly discussion questions, they post and respond to one another’s short papers, and Prof. Gussman responds to writings and initiates additional discussion.

Last term, Prof. Gussman coordinated a roundtable presentation on 19th century women writers and web resources at the SSAWW conference (http://caxton.stockton.edu/adops/stories/storyReader$14). As a result of that panel, Lisa Honaker and Prof. Gussman will be having students in “Introduction to Literary Research” working as “testers” for an on-line Emily Dickinson project headed by Martha Nell Smith of the Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities (the details are still being worked out).

Honaker LITT Fall 06, Technology in the Classroom Snapshot

In the fall of 2006 Professor Honaker devised the following project that incorporated various kinds of technology in her two sections of “Introduction to Literary Research”:

- **Hypertext project on Irish playwrights**: 46 students created hypertext versions of five plays: John M. Synge’s *In the Shadow of the Glen*, Lady Augusta Gregory’s *The Dragon*, George Bernard Shaw’s *Augustus Does His Bit*, Oscar Wilde’s *Salome*, and Samuel Beckett’s *Krapp’s Last Tape*.
  - Thirty-four students annotated passages from the plays, creating pop-up labels that displayed dictionary definitions, cultural, historical and literary references, and interpretive material of their own devising as well as from secondary sources.
  - Seven students wrote essays posted with the plays, ranging from biographies of individual authors to histories of Irish Theatre, the Theatre of the Absurd and Literary Modernism.
  - Five students were responsible for the overall blog design and in posting the plays and making sure that all of the annotations worked.

  The project may be found at [http://caxton.stockton.edu/irishplaywrights/](http://caxton.stockton.edu/irishplaywrights/).

- **PowerPoint presentations**: Every student in both classes did a PowerPoint presentation on a contemporary playwright. These presentations included a brief biography with emphasis on the writer’s development as a playwright, a bibliography of the playwright’s major works, a close look at the production process of one play, three popular reviews of the playwright’s work, and a works cited page formatted in MLA style.

- **Basic blog-building review**: Designed to prepare those members of the class who were involved in a service-learning project with the Rittenberg Middle School in Egg Harbor City. Students were prepared to go into Connie Burzo’s seventh and eighth grade classes and help them with their writing and with building blogs. (As it turned out, they did not help with blogging but with writing instruction alone. We hope to get to the blog work in the coming semester.)
Honaker LITT Technology Overview

Prof. Honaker uses technology in all of her classes. In the Fall 2006 semester, for example, Prof. Honaker’s research students created a hypertext called “Irish Playwrights” (http://caxton.stockton.edu/irishplaywrights), with plays by Synge, Lady Gregory, Wilde, Shaw, and Beckett getting well and truly annotated.

Prof. Honaker also did a blog refresher for her research students so that a number of them could help tutor Connie Burzo’s Rittenberg Middle Schoolers with blog creation. While the students did not actually do much with the blogs, the service-learning project with Connie Burzo will be ongoing. We are planning that this work will happen in the spring. (The students were need for more writing and reading-centered tutoring this fall.)

Jacobson LITT Fall 06, Technology in the Classroom Snapshot

Prof. Jacobson also taught all of her Literature classes in “smart” classrooms, regularly using the room’s Internet and projection capabilities. She also utilized the smart classroom to incorporate music, PowerPoint, and video into her lectures and as tools to spark discussion. She maintains her grade book using Excel and frequently uses email to converse with her students.

Domestic Dramas
- WebCT course site
- Students created PowerPoint presentations
- Analysis of film and television

Senior Seminar:
- WebCT course site
- Students created two PowerPoint presentations (or utilized some other electronic medium to create a visual aide) to teach a topic related to the course and to present some aspect of their research
- Students read and studied hypertext
  - One student created his own hypertext story using the program storyspace as part of his final thesis

Jacobson LITT Technology Overview

Prof. Jacobson joined the Stockton Literature program with a commitment to engaging and empowering students with technology. To this end, she frequently incorporates PowerPoint, video, music, and Internet resources in her classes. Prof. Jacobson’s student presentations also utilize these skills and resources. Her students also build weblogs and interact and access information via email and WebCT.

Acceptance to the College’s Summer Tech Academy will greatly enhance Prof. Jacobson’s use of technology in the classroom. She specifically plans to learn, produce, and teach podcasts in her 2007/2008 Literature and General Studies courses.
Kinsella LITT Fall 06, Technology in the Classroom Snapshot

Prof. Kinsella enjoys incorporating podcasting into his courses. He also regularly creates a course weblog for all of his classes. This fall he stressed the following technology initiatives.

Literary Methodologies
- Taught students to build and maintain blogs.
- Held a poetry reading that was recorded (but never completely produced/published to the web).
- Expected students to consult the course blog regularly.

Restoration and Early Eighteenth-Century Drama
- Recorded and podcast one dramatic reading by students.
- Expected students to consult course blog regularly.

Kinsella LITT Technology Overview

Kinsella has incorporated technology into his teaching for years, and he continues to do so. Currently he uses weblogs in all of his classes to a variety of pedagogical ends. Blogs have provided an excellent, open platform for communicating with students. They have helped introduce students to the concept of electronic textuality, offering them spaces to write and to create with a ready and, sometimes, extensive audience. Blog use has augmented the program’s pedagogy for several years. An article about blogging in the Press of Atlantic City in January 2006 featured Ken Tompkins and Kinsella, but in fact nearly every faculty member in the LITT program blogs, most of them since the technology first became available at Stockton.

Kinsella has begun to incorporate podcasting into his teaching and hopes to begin to incorporate screen-casting as well. During Spring 2006 he recorded Medieval Ireland class lectures and discussions using a small mp3 recorder. He placed portions of about twenty classes on line. During Fall 2006 he recorded modest portions of his Celtic Mythology and Early Irish Literature course and readings from Restoration drama for his Restoration and Early Eighteenth-Century Drama course. The podcasts for these classes make use of an aggregating weblog, so in theory students can subscribe to the blog, receive automatic downloads when new material is posted, and sync that material to their mp3 players. You can hear his Irish podcasts at

http://caxton.stockton.edu/irelandpodcasts/

Professor Tompkins and, to a much lesser extent, Kinsella are also working on “screen casts.” These are screen captures with audio made into QuickTime movies. Kinsella posted crude screen-casts on-line for his Spring 2006 grammar class: brief discussions of prepositional phrases. Students repeatedly state that grammatical analysis looks easy when he shows examples on the board, but it gets “super hard” as soon as they go home. His initial screen-casts are modest efforts that with refinement may help to solve this problem. He has also created a modified screen-cast describing a reconstructed medieval
Irish rath or ring fort. As students look at a series of pictures on a web page, they listen to an expert (Kinsella’s brother) describe the images and discuss early Irish life.

Professors Tompkins and Kinsella have shared their knowledge of weblogs with members of the Stockton Community. They presented to members of the ISCT in Fall 2005; Kinsella presented alone to ISCT participants in Spring and Fall 2006. They also gave an ARHU-wide presentation on blogging, podcasting, and screencasting.

On August 22nd, 2006, the LITT program held a pre-workshop for 7-12 teachers entitled “Language Arts Literacy Meets the Blog!” We demonstrated pedagogical uses of blogs in the Language Arts Literacy Classroom and solicited ideas and advice from participants in order to develop ready-for-classroom materials for future workshops. Fifteen teachers from several school districts attended this pre-workshop, which was a clear success. We are beginning to plan more comprehensive and, we believe, more useful workshops for next spring or summer.

**Long LITT Fall 06, Technology in the Classroom Snapshot**

In preparation for his first hybrid workshop in the Spring 2007 semester, Prof. Long did not utilize technology in his creative writing classes during the Fall 2006 term.

**Long LITT Technology Overview**

Prof. Long characterizes himself as someone attracted to all media, but wedded to none. Prof. Long explains that he tends to use technology for specific purposes in given classes, rather than consistently using some form in all. For example, Prof. Long has several hour-long PowerPoint presentations on sex, gender, sexuality, intersexuality, and queer theory, which are graph and picture intensive. He developed these presentations over several years and has presented them both in the US and abroad. He now uses these PowerPoints in his two of his General Studies classes (“Body Across Disciplines” and “Queer Autobiographies”) as well as for guest lectures in other classrooms at Stockton. He sees PowerPoint as valuable when he wants to assemble a large range of data into a single presentation—not simply as an outline of a lecture.

Prof. Long often brings his computer or a tape deck to writing and literature classes, in order to present recorded lectures and readings by contemporary writers. In his “21st Century Literature and Globalization” course Prof. Long also heavily used the technology classroom for videos, films and Internet sources, where quick references to websites that related to global issues was essential. He also recently developed a personal weblog, “everywhere is falling everywhere”: http://titania.stockton.edu:8888/wpmu/longn/.

In Spring 2007 Prof. Long is teaching his first hybrid workshop: student poems are posted on the web and students will comment on them (as well as on other comments). As this is a new approach for Prof. Long, he will monitor how students react to the online workshop and ask them to compare it to the classroom workshop, with the hopes of integrating it permanently into the workshop classes.
Tompkins LITT Fall 06, Technology in the Classroom Snapshot

During the Fall 2006 semester Prof. Tompkins taught:
  • weblog construction,
  • weblogs
  • searching the Internet, and
  • searching Internet literature sources

He also used class weblogs, online resources, and podcasting in each class. In “Search For the Grail” he also utilized films and an electronic grade book.

Tompkins LITT Technology Overview

Ken Tompkins has been one of the primary influences for the Program to implement technology in its classes. He has been using such technologies since the early 1980s. He set up the first college microlab in 1985, established the first conferencing system in 1988, installed the first webpage server in 1993, convinced the Program to require all LITT majors to have webpages in the mid-1990s, changed that requirement to weblogs in 2000, installed the first Wiki in 2003 and has recently been instrumental in moving to WordPress weblogs. He is also the author of both the New Media Studies track in the LITT Program and the Masters of Arts of Instructional Technology (MAIT), which was the second graduate degree at the college.

He continues to see technology in the classroom as a significant means of building community, of delivering content, of informing and of placing literature in a wider context. He co-authored a presentation at the New Chaucer Society in July as part of a session on the Digital Chaucer. The presentation was on using a Wiki for student comments on Chaucer criticism and some of the major tales. Most recently, he has designed a Podcasting/Screencasting course, which he will teach in the Spring term. The course will use literary texts as the content for teaching LITT students how to create effective and interesting podcasts. This course is certainly one of the first college courses on this process.

Summary of Literature Program Technology Use

It should, then, be evident that the LITT Program is committed to integrating technologies into its classes, that the Program takes seriously its commitment to preparing teachers for the public schools by encouraging them to take technology seriously and that the Program understands that critical things are happening to our ideas and definitions of texts and textuality and that a Literature Program is the ideal arena for such knowledge to be gathered and taught.

Focus on Reading

Reading, perhaps even more than writing, provides the foundation of any Literature major’s education. The Literature program at Stockton prides itself on providing students with opportunities to read both broadly and deeply.
Gussman LITT Fall 06, Reading in the Classroom Snapshot

American Drama/LITT 3240
- Read 17 full-length 20th-century plays, most of which were collected in the anthology by Steven Watt and Gary A. Richardson, *American Drama: Colonial to Contemporary*, 2003. The average length of the play was 25 (small print) pages, though a few were significantly longer.
- The selections were diverse, including five plays by women, four plays by African-American writers (male and female), one play each by a Mexican-American, and an Asian-American writer, and four plays that confronted issues of homosexuality.
- The styles and movements presented included tragedy, melodrama, agitprop, expressionism, realism, feminism, black arts movement, post-modernism, meta-theatre, performance art.

American Romanticism/LITT 3210
- Read 8 texts, including two novels (Nathaniel Hawthorne’s *The Scarlet Letter* and Lydia Maria Child’s *Hobomok*), two autobiographical narratives William Apess’ *A Son of the Forest* and Harriet Jacobs’ *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl*), two essay collections (Emerson and Thoreau), and two collections/work of poetry (Dickinson and Whitman).
- Read approximately 50 pages per class, or 1200 pages.
- Each student also read a minimum of three secondary essays.
- Norton Critical editions of the works were used when possible, as these editions include both contemporary reviews and critical essays which students read, presented on, and incorporated into their final papers.

Literary Methodologies/LITT 1101
- Students were assigned readings from different texts.
- Students read the complete text of Sophie Treadwell’s expressionist play, *Machinal* and of Susan Glaspell’s one-act play *Trifles*.
- From the fiction anthology, *American Short Story Masterpieces*, edited by Raymond Carver and Tom Jenks (1987), students sampled a range of contemporary American authors, from frequently taught writers such as James Baldwin, Flannery O’Connor and Bernard Malamud, and Joyce Carol Oates to somewhat lesser known figures such as Vance Bourjaily, Tess Gallagher, Gail Godwin, and Mark Helprin.
- These readings were supplemented by relevant chapters and entries from Thomas C. Foster’s *How to Read Literature Like a Professor: A Lively and Entertaining Guide to Reading Between the Lines* (2003), and Murfin and Ray’s *The Bedford Glossary of Critical and Literary Terms* (2003).
Honaker LITT Fall 06, Reading in the Classroom Snapshot

There is little specific assigned reading in Research, though students do significant amounts of reading in the course of fulfilling their research responsibilities. In this course, the class as a whole read three Beckett plays: *Waiting for Godot*, *Endgame*, and *Happy Days*. They read much additional material about Beckett and some read additional work by Beckett, but this reading was determined by their research topics.

Jacobson LITT Fall 06, Reading in the Classroom Snapshot

Domestic Dramas
The course had six required contemporary texts that surveyed a range of authors, subject positions, and included both novels and plays:

- **Novel**: *House of Sand and Fog* by Andre Dubus III
- **Play**: *Boston Marriage* by David Mamet
- **Collection of Plays**: *Seven Plays* by Sam Shepard
- **Novel**: *A Home at the End of the World* by Michael Cunningham
- **Novel**: *Geographies of Home* by Loida Maritza Perez
- **Novel**: *Sent for You Yesterday* by John Edgar Wideman

In order to challenge the notion that only women and women writers engage the domestic, the course featured male authors and considered whether or not the author’s gender impacted his/her understanding of the domestic sphere.

Senior Seminar
The course had three required texts:

- **1 novel (critical edition)**: *White Noise: Texts and Criticism* by Don DeLillo
  - Read the novel plus the critical essays
- **1 Anthology**: *Postmodern American Fiction: A Norton Anthology* edited by Paula Geyh, Fred G. Leebron, and Andrew Levy
  - Read 52 different authors/texts: primarily excerpted from longer works, both fiction and critical essays
- **1 theoretical text**: *Postmodernism: A Very Short Introduction* by Christopher Butler

Beyond the required reading, the students conducted research for their final thesis that required additional reading. Students at least skimmed twenty sources, for example, in order to compose an annotated bibliography of secondary sources related to their research topic.

Kinsella LITT Fall 06, Reading in the Classroom Snapshot

Literary Methodologies

- **3 plays**: all Sam Shepard plays
- **1 anthology of short stories**: 12 stories read
- **1 short anthology of poetry**: 28 poems read

Restoration and Early Eighteenth-Century Drama
• 12 plays read
• additional secondary essays read (quantity left to students)

Long LITT Fall 06, Reading in the Classroom Snapshot

Living American Poets (LITT 3242-001):
• 7 books plus 35 page hand out
• 30 additional texts on reserve for which each student had to read one.
• 4 out of the 7 texts were minority authors

Creative Writing Workshop (LITT 3270.001)
• Two texts, plus 300 pages of student work to be critiqued

Tompkins LITT Fall 06, Reading in the Classroom Snapshot

Shakespeare
• 15 plays
• 7 chapters of ancillary, contextual readings

Literary Methodologies
• 43 pages of a poetry anthology
• 147 pages of a short story anthology
• 15 pages of a play = 205 pages
These readings came from all periods of English and American poetry, from modern American short stories, and also included a twentieth-century Irish play.

Search For the Grail
• 10 books ranging from Medieval romances to a novel about the Vietnam war.

Focus on Oral Communications

Gussman LITT Fall 06, Oral Communications in the Classroom Snapshot

Students participate in some kind of oral presentation or performance in all of Prof. Gussman’s classes. In “American Drama,” students worked in groups of three-five students to interpret and present a 30-minute scene from a play we were studying. Students performed the material, created programs, costumes, sets and props. The rest of the class participated in an informal discussion of the performance during the same period.

In “American Romanticism” students worked either individually or in pairs to create a PowerPoint presentation that summarized and evaluated one contemporary review and one secondary source of the work being studied in class that week.

In “Literary Methodologies,” students recited the poems that they were working on in their final weblog projects before the rest of the class, and explained what interested them in the poem they chose.
Honaker LITT Fall 06, Oral Communications in the Classroom Snapshot

PowerPoint Presentation: Each student in the class did a PowerPoint presentation on a contemporary playwright

Jacobson LITT Fall 06, Oral Communications in the Classroom Snapshot

One of the essential goals of both Prof. Jacobson’s Fall 2006 classes was to sharpen students’ oral expressiveness. To this end, Prof. Jacobson required all her students to participate actively in course discussion.

Domestic Dramas
- Teaching Presentation with visual aide: done individually or with one other student
- Class participation evaluated: students were sent midterm feedback so they could maintain or improve their level of active engagement in course discussion

Senior Seminar
- Teaching Presentation w/ Visual Aid (15-20 minutes): This presentation informed the class about an assigned literary, historical, or cultural element significant to our understanding of the assigned reading. Students signed up in a group of 2 or did the presentation individually. Each presentation used some type of visual aide (for example, a PowerPoint presentation and/or handout) and provided to the class and instructor with a bibliography of at least 5 sources on the topic. All group members were required to speak during the course of the 15-20-minute presentation.
- Research Presentation (10 minutes, plus 5 minutes for questions and answers): The final two weeks of class were set aside for student presentations of their final research papers. To encourage active listening and questions from the student audience members, extra credit could be earned for asking the presenter questions about his/her project or argument.
- Regular, spirited class participated required.

Kinsella LITT Fall 06, Oral Communications in the Classroom Snapshot

Literary Methodologies
- Class poetry reading held during one class: Each student (and teacher) read a poem in front of the class while being recorded.
- Each student was expected to speak regularly during class discussion (and nearly everyone did).

Restoration and Early Eighteenth-Century Drama
- Students were called upon regularly to read portions of the plays.
- We held two dramatic readings, each with three students reading in front of the class while being recorded.
Long LITT Fall 06, Oral Communications in the Classroom Snapshot

Living American Poets
- Half hour presentation on a book of poems: the presentation included reading poems and leading class discussion
- Daily in-class readings of all poems discussed

Creative Writing Workshop (LITT 3270.001):
- Daily discussion of student work in workshop

Tompkins LITT Fall 06, Oral Communications in the Classroom Snapshot

Prof. Tompkins did not teach oral communication skills during the Fall 06 semester.

Precepting
We all take our commitment to precepting seriously, with our goals being to make sure that our students get the kinds of courses they need in a timely fashion. We make sure that they do not only follow the curriculum but that they also take courses in areas in which they may need work. We advise students to take writing courses, for instance, when their work in our classes suggests they need additional practice. We advise them to work as many graduation requirements into single courses as they are able (which EDUC students in particular appreciate) and help them understand the variety of requirements they must fulfill. A timely and cost-effective graduation depends not only on a student’s ability to negotiate our curriculum but also to negotiate the Qs, Vs, Gs, and other alphabetical hurdles the college mandates. We consider ourselves good and conscientious preceptors.

The number of preceptees assigned to LITT faculty sometimes makes achieving the above goals difficult. If we only used precepting days to meet with students, we would, at best, be able to meet with individual students for only five or ten minutes.

Table 29: Total Number of Preceptees Assigned LITT Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Assigned LITT Preceptees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-1998</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-1999</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-2000</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strikingly, the Literature program faculty now advise all but a handful of our declared majors. Literature has 328 declared majors, and the six core Literature faculty (Gussman,
Honaker, Jacobson, Kinsella, Long, Tompkins) collectively advise 320 students.

As in past years, the total number of preceptees assigned to program faculty does not accurately represent program size—since students are often advised by faculty and administrators outside the program—or our precepting duties. A few other factors contribute to faculty counts of preceptees being larger than those figures declared above, provided by the Academic advising office. The above numbers do not account for:

- Students we are precepting who forget to turn in the form and/or whose form is never processed;
- Students who have completed BA requirements and require precepting while completing their EDUC requirements;
- Minors we precept unofficially; and
- Students who don't trust their official (usually non-LITT) preceptors who come to us for second opinions.

Our majors rightly and ideally would like a Literature faculty member to serve as their preceptor and faculty members frequently informally advise students who are not listed on their official roster. Some faculty members are popular with non-majors as well. Students have been known to bring friends to advising sessions so that they, too, can chat with a Literature faculty member. For example, Thomas Kinsella reports that, including walk-in appointments by students who are not his preceptees (as coordinator Professor Kinsella assumes a large amount of walk-in business), he met with seventy-three students for normally 30 minutes per student over the 10-day precepting period in the fall of 2006. This additional thirty-six and a half hours of work carries no compensation; it is considered a part of normal teaching duties.

Table 30: Number of Preceptees Assigned Individual LITT Faculty, Fall 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gussman</td>
<td>Deborah</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>LITT</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honaker</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>LITT</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobson</td>
<td>Kristin</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>LITT</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinsella</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>LITT</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>LITT</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tompkins</td>
<td>Kenneth</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>LITT</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the next table demonstrates, our average preceptor caseload is the highest in the division.

Table 31: Preceptor Caseload Averages for ARHU Programs (AY06-07)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Average Caseload</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITT</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When we compare Literature program numbers with other programs, we see inequities that suggest our precepting duties go above and beyond the “normal” teaching and advising duties. Combined with our larger than average class sizes and the intensive writing and reading curriculum outlined in the snapshots, the Literature program faculty fears we will soon be unable to provide a quality liberal arts education for our majors.

In terms of precepting, the implementation of the new Banner system promises to reduce our bookkeeping advising duties. Despite its obvious flaws and current bugs, it is already a great improvement over previous support, and we expect implementation of the system to improve both student and faculty understanding of progress made toward graduation. However, bookkeeping of achieved and remaining graduation requirements comprises only a portion of precepting. Some, in fact, would argue that the most labor-intensive component of precepting involves one-on-one career and course selection advising. As you may imagine, stacking 44-65 students into 15-minute blocks over a two-day precepting period is not feasible. Meetings with students sometimes run longer than expected and students sometimes arrive late.

Imagine for a moment the very different precepting days of an average Literature faculty member with 55 preceptees and an average Language faculty member with 17.

The average Literature faculty member with 58 preceptees requires 14.5 hours or about 2, seven and one-half hour advising days to meet with all of his or her preceptees once for 15 minutes each.

The average Language faculty member with 17 preceptees requires 4.25 hours or about 2, two hour advising days to meet with all of his or her preceptees once for 15 minutes each.

The following chart maps the disparate workload among ARHU faculty based on the minimum suggested meeting time of 15 minutes per student for one precepting meeting per semester.
Table 32: Preceptor Workload in Hours (Estimated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARHU Program</th>
<th>Preceptor Workload in Hours (Estimated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LITT</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTV</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTP</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANG</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between one 2-hour day of work and a nearly eight-hour day is obvious. The average Literature program faculty member has over three times the number of average LANG preceptees. When we consider the impact of this work ratio over the course of a year and one’s career, the discrepancies become even more profound.

During one academic year the average LITT faculty member would need to spend 29 hours precepting to meet with all of his or her students twice for 15 minutes each. During the same amount of time, the average LANG faculty member would need to spend 8.5 hours to meet with his or her preceptees twice for 15 minutes each. Over the course of five years (the time period generally needed to earn tenure and/or promotion), the difference in workload measures 145 hours for the Literature faculty member versus 42.5 hours for the Language faculty member. In practical terms, the larger workload clearly results in less time for the Literature faculty member to complete research, grading, course development, and service to the program and division.

Furthermore, the block of time accounted for on precepting days (15 minute meetings) does not account for students who require more than two meetings per year or meetings longer than 15 minutes to discuss career, graduate school, or other advising matters (e.g. failing a course, academic probation, scholarship and internship opportunities). The Literature faculty member and the Literature program coordinator also complete more graduation audits.
Certainly, not all students visit their preceptor on a regular basis; students may register for classes without consulting their preceptor. However, there is no indication that Literature majors use their preceptors markedly less than any other major within the division or across the college. In fact, the large number of our students who pursue education degrees following their Literature B.A. might suggest they utilize precepting more than the “average” student. In order to avoid taking additional classes, these students pursuing careers in education seek advice from both Literature and Education faculty.

The Tracks—Breakdown of Spring 2007 Data
The changes in our tracks and curriculum combined with the implementation of the new Banner system has made obtaining clear numbers of the number of majors in each track a bit confusing. Discrepancies between the number of majors listed for the Spring 2007 semester (334) and the total number of majors listed in the various tracks (398) also adds to this confusion. The division staff, particularly Nancy Messina, worked to clarify and classify our program track and majors numbers, but glitches in Banner continue to make this task difficult, if not (at least at present) impossible to resolve.

Banner currently lists 11 possible tracks in Literature, each broken into the number of first-year, sophomore, junior, and senior standing students within that track. These numbers become more meaningful when adjusted to reflect our curricular changes over the past five years and our current four tracks: Literary Studies (which includes students in the education and graduate school tracks), Creative Writing, New Media Studies, and Theatre/English. Additionally, there are students listed in Banner that have selected a Literature major, but have not selected a specific track.

Table 33: Literature Program Numbers by Track (Spring 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Track</th>
<th>First-Year</th>
<th>Sophomore</th>
<th>Junior</th>
<th>Senior</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literary Studies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Media Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre/English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Declared Track</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>121</strong></td>
<td><strong>197</strong></td>
<td><strong>398</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obviously, the program hopes to receive clarification on our actual numbers soon. The difference between 334 majors and 398 is 64 students, or two courses of 32 students each.

Alumni Careers
The college, division, and the program do not currently have the resources required to track formally our alumni and their careers. However, our informal contacts with Literature alumni reveals interesting careers and positive feelings about the Literature program following graduation.
As reported in our last self-study, the Fall 1999 questionnaire with 78 respondents (out of 500+ letters sent) revealed the following.

- Business 16
- Computing 3
- Creative Writing 3
- Education 28
- Elementary 6
- Secondary 20
- Higher 2
- Law 2
- Public Relations 4
- Publishing/Journalism 10
- Religion 2
- Social Work 3
- Alumni who have obtained advanced degrees (or are currently seeking such degrees): 19

Education is the chosen field of more than a quarter of the respondents.

Those in business held jobs ranging from game warden, to president of a building and contracting firm, to owner of a martial arts academy.

Outreach to Alumni and Current Students & Co-Curricular Activities

The Challenge
In 2002, Josephine A. Koster, the external reviewer for the Literature program, expressed some concern about the program’s ability to provide sufficient academic advising and internships counseling to our students. She proposed three specific solutions to these challenges:

1) the development of a separate English Education track
2) a more developed internship program, and
3) the development of listserv for our majors and alumni.

Since that review, the program has worked hard to address Koster concerns about how to increase and improve outreach.

The Execution of Our Goal to Increase and Improve Outreach

Curricular Changes to Meet Student, State, and Program Needs
As described in the curriculum section, the program developed not just one but two tracks for its students pursuing careers in Education. Unfortunately, by 2006 it was clear that these separate tracks did not prove to make precepting easier for the students or their faculty advisors. The changing requirements for NJ education standards continues to suggest that the program best equipped to advise students in Education is the Education program. Similarly, Literature faculty are the ideal preceptors for Literature majors. As a
result, Literature faculty preceptors encourage students to attend the monthly advising workshops offered by the Education program and to consult with the Education program for the specific “Highly Qualified Teacher” requirements.

Both the Education and Literature programs understand our students’ desire for “one-stop” advising: where all a student’s advising needs could be met by a single individual faculty member. However, as with any double major, especially one that crosses divisional lines, this request is difficult to deliver. While potentially more time-consuming for the student, tandem precepting between Literature (to complete the content major) and Education (to complete the State Education requirements), provides the best results and assures our Literature-Education students are on track to graduate in a timely fashion.

Literature Program Internships
Tom Kinsella spearheaded the development of an ARHU internship initiative. Meetings were held with interested faculty and research completed on initiatives in other divisions. The ARHU Dean has been generous in his support for this initiative, resulting in the hiring of Lisa Donato, a recent LITT alumnus, as support personnel. Ms. Donato helps faculty to develop and supervise internships more effectively and efficiently. Ms. Donato recently left Stockton for another job. The Literature Program looks forward to working with the new staff member that fills this position. A copy of the Program’s internship guidelines is included as Appendix II.

Last year, as this initiative got underway, several LITT students interned for the Atlantic City Weekly and one interned for New Jersey Lifestyles magazine. As part of their New Media Studies requirements, Michael Kappeler worked as a web design intern at NBC interactive in Los Angeles, while Katie Dunn completed an internship at the Atlantic Country Utilities authority, creating an interactive guidebook for the Poetry Trail project at their headquarters—a project designed to heighten participants’ appreciation of both nature and poetry in a public environment. Samples of the book can be seen here: http://www.acua.com/poetrytrail/dedication1.html. New Media internship students reported to their advisor, Scott Rettberg, that their respective internships were fulfilling education and professional experiences and provided them with valuable real world application of the skills they learned in New Media courses and Literature program courses generally.

Alumni and Major Listserv & Alumni Newsletter
In the last five years we have also continued our efforts to reach out to our majors, minors, and alumni, to find out from them about what sorts of careers they had found after Literature and what use their Literature degrees were to them in those careers. This fall our division purchased the necessary hardware and software to manage and maintain listserves. (Surprisingly, the college and division lagged behind making this tool readily available.) The Literature program immediately set up two listserves: one for alumni and one for its majors. Alumni contacts were encouraged to join and any of those we may have missed can access the link to join the listserv from the program’s “Alumni News” homepage: http://caxton.stockton.edu/theLITTprogram/stories/storyReader$16.
We also continue to stay in touch with our alumni through an electronic newsletter we distribute each semester. The newsletter includes program news, including notices about new appointments, research interests, and up-coming and past program events. Newsletters from AY 05-06 can be found on the Program’s webpage: http://caxton.stockton.edu/theLITTprogram/stories/storyReader$16.

Career and Graduate School Workshops
We draw from our alumni database for outreach activities. Occasionally, for example we invite past students to speak to our current students about their jobs, how they got them, and how useful their Literature training was proving in their careers. We have had lawyers, teachers, editors, public relations people, and librarians talk. We have also invited representatives from Stockton’s Career Services office to these panels so that students are aware of the sorts of help available to them in preparing to enter the job market. We also continue to organize panels about preparing for graduate school. (C.f. Appendix VI.) Such panels have been well attended. Many of our students reported that these panels were both eye-opening and comforting. Knowing that there are careers (“besides teaching”) and ways to pursue graduate school have significantly reduced their anxieties about life after Stockton.

Middle and High School Teacher Technology Workshop
The Literature faculty and Craig Myrtetus from the Education program planned and executed a workshop for grade 7-12 teachers on the academic uses of weblogs, podcasts, and other recent developments in computing. Having worked with these technologies for a while now, we decided to reach out to the local teaching community. Additionally, since many of our graduates are now teaching in local school districts, we had good contacts and support for this program. If given institution support, we should be able to continue this service to area teachers.

Literature and Medicine Project
Individual faculty members are also engaged in community outreach. Ken Tompkins and now Tom Kinsella serve as discussion facilitators in a Literature and Medicine Project that the Atlantic City Medical Center—Mainland Division. The project, started by the Humanities Council of Maine and now in thirteen states, brings health care providers together with a facilitator to discuss literature. The Project is an effort to encourage health care workers to listen carefully to personal narratives of their patients by having read various short stories and poems dealing with issues of caring.

Visiting Writers Series and Guest Speakers
Lisa Honaker and now Nathan Long coordinate the program’s Visiting Writers Series. Visiting writers over the past five years include both regional, national, and internationally recognized writers, such as: poets Stephen Dunn, Marilyn Nelson, and Peter Murphy, nonfiction writers Mimi Schwartz and Judy Copeland, and fiction writers Nathan Long and Tony D’Souza. The series is sponsored by local donors and by an annual fund raising event, the Ravenswood Reading. Typically, the Visiting Writers Series has 4-6 readings a year and has just begun two new traditions: an alumni reading
in the spring, and the acquisition, through the library, of the writers' prominent books prior to the reading, which all lows the campus community to come to the readings better with a better understanding of the writers.

**Stockpot**

Stockpot, Stockton’s annual literary journal, is a student-run literary journal of student work. Nathan Long advises Stockpot, but students make all editorial decisions. The journal is produced in late spring in conjunction with a student reading. Funding for the journal is through the student activity fees. You can find a podcast of last spring’s reading at: http://caxton.stockton.edu/stockpot2006/.

**End of Year Awards & Social Event: The Bash**

In addition to the activities listed above, we continue to host an end-of-term party for our students each spring, where program faculty prepare what can only be termed a feast. At “the Bash,” as we fondly call it, creative writing students read poetry and short fiction, and cash awards are handed out for the best literary essay, weblog, poetry, and fiction.

**Student Organizations**

The Literature program sponsors three student organizations:

1) Sigma Tau Delta, a chapter of a national honor society for English majors, which restricts membership through grade point average and literature course requirements;
2) The Literature Club, open to all students, and
3) Idols of the Tribe, an alternative literary club created last year.

Sigma Tau Delta and the Literature Club do not enjoy a great deal of student participation. Idols of the Tribe, which received their Student Government charter last year, also faces the challenges of a largely commuter campus. The current faculty sponsor of all three groups is Deb Gussman.

**College-wide Initiatives & the Literature Program**

The Literature program contributes to a variety of college-wide initiatives.

**Technology Initiative**

As the previous discussion of our use of technology in the classroom indicates, we spearhead as well as support the college’s on-going technology initiatives.

**Service Learning Initiative**

Deb Gussman will be incorporating service-learning opportunities in all of her Spring 2007 courses.

**Women’s Studies**

With few exceptions, Deborah Gussman, Nathan Long, and Kristin Jacobson teach at least one course per year, either in LITT or General studies, in support of the Women’s Studies minor. Profs. Long and Jacobson also participated in the 2006-07 Women's Studies Forum.
First-Year Seminar

Writing Across the Curriculum
With few exceptions, the Literature faculty teach all of our courses as W1 or W2 in support of the writing across the curriculum program.

General Studies Attributes
Several of Deborah Gussman’s literature courses, including “Literature by Women” and “Native American Literature” have an “I” designation, fulfilling the “international or multicultural” requirement for students.

Day of Scholarship
Deborah Gussman served for several years on the Day of Scholarship committee. Kristin Jacobson presented at the 2006 Day of Scholarship and will present at the Day of Scholarship again this spring as will Nathan Long.

ARHU Presentations
Several Literature faculty have contributed to the Division and College by presenting their research. Lisa Honaker (“Revolution in a ‘Poison-Bad World’: Robert Louis Stevenson's Prince Otto and New Arabian Nights”), Nathan Long (“Spaces Between Boy and Girl”), and Kristin Jacobson (“Anxious Male Domesticity: American Masculinity’s Corrections”) all participated in the division’s ARHU Speaks series. Ken Tompkins and Tom Kinsella also presented materials on podcasting and screencasting as part of this series. Ken Tompkins, additionally, created a podcast on “Aggregating in the Classroom.” Thanks to the work of Ken Tompkins, all the ARHU presentations can be listened to at the following site: http://caxton.stockton.edu/arhuspeaks/.

Education Program
Deborah Gussman is currently a member of the Faculty Advisory Committee for Education. Along with Professor Deborah Gussman, Tom Kinsella served as member of the Faculty Assembly ad hoc committee to develop a proposal for the Masters of Arts in Education program at Stockton, January – October 2003. The program has been up and running since September 2004. Tom Kinsella has also served on the EDUC Program committee for reappointment and tenure from Fall 2004 to Spring 2007.

College-Wide Assessment
Tom Kinsella served as Co-Chair of the “Faculty” subcommittee of the Middle States Institutional Self Study, 2001.

Honors Program
Tom Kinsella served as a member of Faculty Assembly ad hoc committee to develop a proposal for an Honors Program at Stockton, October 2003–March 2004 and then served as member of the Honors Program Steering Committee, Fall 2004 – Spring 2006.
Odyssey Project

A participant in this project since its inception at Stockton in 2003, Lisa Honaker has been the project director since 2004.

The Odyssey Project is an innovative collaboration among high school teachers, selected Stockton faculty, and the New York Times, to address the “senior slump” and better prepare those students for the paths they choose after high school. The project’s participants have collaboratively developed five objectives that inform its activities. It seeks

1. to encourage interdisciplinary approaches to learning;
2. to foster cross cultural appreciation;
3. to prepare responsible citizens;
4. to promote critical self-reflection and
5. to improve evaluation skills.

Unlike advanced placement courses, which focus on the most academically sophisticated students, the Odyssey Project is designed to impact seniors with limited or low aspirations as well. To reinforce the notion that what is done in the classroom is of considerable consequence, the project’s activities have explicitly linked critical thinking with civic engagement by having students focus on their rights and responsibilities as citizens.

Political Engagement Project

Since Summer 2006, Lisa Honaker has been involved in the Political Engagement Project, part of a broad Civic Engagement initiative that encompasses the AASCU American Democracy Project, our Service Learning initiatives, and the NY Times/Odyssey Project. The interlocking activities of the Carnegie-sponsored Political Engagement Project are designed to foster intellectual exchange between faculty and students across the curriculum, beginning with Freshman Seminars and integrating throughout the Richard Stockton College community. The project will integrate political discussions, field trips, guest speakers, debates, literature, periodicals, and other media into existing courses, with a special emphasis on new students. Political engagement reaches beyond electoral politics to include activities that influence social and political institutions, beliefs and practices, as well as public policies and processes. Currently, Lisa Honaker is the project director.

Community and Campus Outreach

Last spring, Lisa Honaker arranged for the program to sponsor a trip to Stockton for students from the Rittenberg Middle School in Egg Harbor City to see the Holocaust play Dear Esther.

As a kind of follow-up to the summer blogging workshop, in Fall 2006, Lisa Honaker worked with Connie Burzo, a literature program alumnus and teacher at the Rittenberg Middle School, to create a service learning project in which students from her research classes worked with Rittenberg seventh and eighth graders on their writing. The project will continue for the research classes in Spring 2007 with blogging help added to the mix.
On September 20th, as part of the Odyssey Project, Lisa Honaker helped bring to campus two journalism classes from Bayville and Absegami High Schools (30 students) for a talk by New York Times Supreme Court reporter, Linda Greenhouse.

In October and November 2006, Lisa Honaker gave three presentations on media literacy to a variety of audiences in support of the Odyssey and Political Engagement Projects: On October 19th, Prof. Honaker did a presentation for a small group of Stockton faculty. On October 20th, she gave an in-service presentation/workshop on the subject for ten teachers at Absegami High School. On November 21, Prof. Honaker gave an in-class presentation to Joanna Michlic’s Holocaust and Genocide course so that they could then use the material for evaluating coverage of the genocide in Darfur.

Prof. Long also participates in enhancing the college’s culture by advising Stockpot, the student literary journal, and co-running with Lisa Honaker the Visiting Writer's Series.

Support Services
Librarian Carolyn Gutierrez's Report on Library Resources in Literature contains the following statistics: The library materials cost attribution for Literature was $20,268.78 for fiscal year 2006. This number includes books, annuals, media, and periodical subscription. In the FY 2002, the Literature program’s allocation and expenditures only totaled $5,759. The total approval plan expenditure for the Arts and Humanities in FY 2002 was $62,759. And, for FY 2006 ARHU’s total cost attribution is $95,666.10.

Also according to Librarian Carolyn Gutierrez’s “Report on Library Resources in Literature,” since 2001 the library has added 1597 titles to the library’s book collection. While these numbers lag behind the History’s 5193 new titles over the past six years, the Literature program—due to its interdisciplinary nature—benefits from the increase in new holdings in all ARHU programs.

These numbers seem adequate to the size and character of the program, just as the library as a whole, has been regularly reported in recent Middle States reports to “exceed recommended holdings for a college of its size and mission” according to Standards for College Libraries. Furthermore, while ten years ago students in “Introduction to Research in Literature” or “Senior Seminar” would have needed to visit Rutgers’ research libraries, Stockton’s access to key electronic databases makes such trips less common. Electronic databases like the MLA Bibliography online, OED online, Humanities Abstracts, Lexus-Nexus, J-Stor, ProjectMuse, and World Cat get a great deal of use by our students. Interlibrary loan fills in any gaps when these electronic databases fail to provide full-text sources. Thus, while our periodical allocation budget is scheduled to decrease by $527 over the next four years (a loss spread out over $-132 per year), our students should remain well served by the Library’s electronic database subscriptions. (See Appendix III and Appendix VII for Gutierrez’s complete “Report on Library Resources in Literature.”)
Facilities and Resources

Creative Writing Lab
The Fall 2006 semester marks the reestablishment of the Creative Writing Lab, a room dedicated to creative writing students, which offers resources on writing, a place to write and hang out, and an ideal setting for conducting creative writing workshops. (Because of space demands across campus, the long-standing Creative Writing Lab was temporarily relocated to less adequate space from the fall of 2004 through the spring of 2006.) Creative writing students also enjoy the opportunity to hear contemporary writers through the LITT program’s Visiting Writer’s Series, and to have their own work featured in the student literary journal, Stockpot, also sponsored by the LITT program.

In addition, we are hoping to expand our resources in terms of our own Creative Writing faculty. While we do not currently have a line for additional creative writing faculty, we are searching for new faculty hires that also have experience teaching poetry. However, new hires would be able to provide, at best, one additional creative writing course per year.

Technology Labs
As one of the most technologically adept programs on campus, Literature’s use of the electronic classrooms and labs at Stockton continues to remain strong over the last five years. In 1997, Nancy Kaplan remarked that only some of the Literature faculty were making use of new technology or incorporating the issues it raised into their classrooms. Today, Hypertext projects, PowerPoint presentations, and weblogs are routine parts of courses at all levels of the curriculum. (See http://caxton.stockton.edu/thestacks/, our weblog portal; http://caxton.stockton.edu/PC/, an Intro to Research ezine; and http://caxton.stockton.edu/DesertedVillage/, an Intro to Research hypertext edition of Oliver Goldsmith’s “The Deserted Village.”)

We no longer opt to use the electronic resources available; we need them. And as more and more faculty across the college integrate technology into their courses, the competition for these resources has grown fiercer. Thus, the program has and continues to lobby for a dedicated humanities computer lab. Such a lab would be useful to several other programs in ARHU, chief among them Visual Arts and Communications. Interdisciplinarity is becoming more and more a part of our thinking about our future. While we see our own program as innovative, we also see the cooperation with other programs necessary for us to mount these new tracks leading to further pedagogical innovations we have not yet imagined.

The Administration
The program enjoys good relationships with both the Divisional and College administration. The administration has supported our requests for replacement faculty when our full-time faculty have gone on sabbaticals or have accepted visiting positions.

The program looks forward to continuing our productive working relationship with the Divisional and College administration. Specifically, as the section “Long Range
Planning” outlines, we will continue to support Divisional and College initiatives. We also hope the Division and College administration will continue to find ways to support faculty research and development in the form of funding. The program would like to see more opportunities for release time as another key means of supporting both junior and senior faculty research and development. Additionally, the program would also like to see the administration devise better equity in precepting duties across the college.

National Trends in Literature

Technology

One of the claims made by our program in this document is that our program works at the cutting edge of New Media Studies. Few undergraduate programs in Literature incorporate technology to the degree and in the ways our program accomplishes. One measure of trends in the discipline is the panels offered at the MLA convention. A look at the program for the 2006 convention, for instance, suggests that interest in New Media studies in literature is surging. At least 20 panels on New Media were offered, including: ¹²

“Visual Culture, New Media, Asian American Studies” (1886)  
“Everquesting: Digital Learning and the Humanities” (1887)  
“Textual Materialties” (1897)  
“Wikis, Authority, and the Public Sphere: Examining the Impact of Dynamic, Multi-authored Digital Texts” (1900)  
“Literary Studies in the Public Sphere” (1900)  
“Terrorism, Technology and Visual Media” (1901)  
“Digital Medievalism and the Single Scholar” (1906)  
“Digital Shakespeares” (1913)  
“High Performance Computing and Textual Studies” (1920)  
“Cybernetics: Signs, Codes, Texts” (1925)  
“The Digital Postcolonial” (1927)  
“Reading Code” (1929)  
“Tenure, Promotion, and Textual Studies” (420)  
“Contexts for Electronic Editing” (1935)  
“Meet the Bloggers: Blogging and the Future of Academia” (1962)  

In fact, there is now a guide to the Digital Sessions at MLA. This year’s guide can be found at: http://www.ach.org/mla/ MLA06/guide.html. The Literature program’s New Media Studies track and the ways we incorporate New Media into traditional literature classes place our undergraduate program at the forefront of this field.

Globalization and Transnationalism

Another trend visible from the MLA program is a surge in papers on issues of globalization, trans-nationalism, and cultural exchange, with as many as 45 panels

organized around these topics. Where this was once the focus of comparative literature and a trend in American literature away from exceptionalism, there appears to be a general move in literary studies as a whole towards the internationalization of the field. Some examples would include such panels as:  

“Globalization Debates: Writers and Audiences” (1871)  
“Theorizing the First Wave Globally” (1872)  
“The Transatlantic Politics of the Aesthetic in the 18th Century” (1874)  
“Slavery in the Americas” (1880)  
“Transnational Feminisms” (1881)  
“Detention and United States Sovereignty” (1887)  
“Transnational Education: Imperialism, Race, Childhood” (1888)  
“American Indian Literatures in Global Contexts” (1888)  
“Transatlantic Travel Writing” (1889)  
“Trade, Colonialism and Global Exchange” (1890)  
“Ethnic Studies in the Age of Transnationalism” (1903)  
“Globalization I: Necropolitics” (1908)  
“The Languages of Transnational Drama and Performance” (1922)  
“Teaching the Transatlantic or Hemispheric Eighteenth Century” (1923)  
“Poetry and Transnationalism” (1927)  
“Print Cultures in the Atlantic World” (1929)  
“Writing Across Borders: Literature, Internationalism and the American Civil War” (1931)  
“Transpacific Configuration of Nation and Subjectivity” (1941)  
“Transatlantic Hawthorne: Influences and Interventions” (1983)  

Kristin Jacobson’s “Contemporary American Literature: (Post)Colonial Perspectives” and Nathan Long’s “21st Century Literature and Globalization,” for example, help the program keep pace with this important trend. Judging from the candidates we interviewed at MLA in December and whom we will invite to campus this spring, the person who fulfills the Multi-Ethnic Literature of the United States position will also expose students to a more international understanding of literature and culture. As we discuss in the “Long Range Planning” section, to formalize and strengthen this area, we would like to add a faculty member to our program who specializes in World Literatures. The renaissance in this “traditional” specialty would add a dynamic presence to our program and campus, broadening through its global perspective, our course offerings in both General Studies and Literature.

Civic Engagement and the Humanities

Increasingly, disciplines across the humanities are incorporating civic engagement into their curricula. The public humanities movement crystallized with the adoption of the

13 Source: Ibid.
“Declaration on the Civic Responsibilities of Higher Education” on July 4, 1999, a document endorsed by more than 300 university and college presidents nationwide.14

Work in this area includes projects, courses, and alliances that explore and promote the ways in which exposure to arts and humanities can have positive personal, professional and more broadly social effects on students. This trend also seeks to alert students to the ways in which government and community policy impacts the arts and humanities and their practice. Proponents of civic engagement in the humanities argue that the arts and humanities are a good route to greater community and political engagement. An overview of some of the work being done in this area can be found on the University of Texas-Austin’s Humanities Institute website:

Lisa Honaker leads the program in incorporating civic engagement. Since the Summer of 2006, Prof. Honaker has been involved in the Political Engagement Project, part of a broad Civic Engagement initiative that encompasses the AASCU American Democracy Project, our Service Learning initiatives, and the NY Times/Odyssey Project. The interlocking activities of the Carnegie-sponsored Political Engagement Project are designed to foster intellectual exchange between faculty and students across the curriculum, beginning with Freshman Seminars and integrating throughout the Richard Stockton College community. Additionally, both Lisa Honaker and Deb Gussman’s sections of “Introduction to Literary Research” incorporate service learning by connection Research students with an area middle school.

BFA in Creative Writing
Within creative writing there is a trend to offer more undergraduate instruction, including offering BFAs in Creative Writing. A BFA typically increased the number of credits taken in the major area of study, giving students a more concentrated focus and opportunity to hone their skills.

With only one full-time Creative Writing faculty member, the Literature program could not currently support a BFA in Creative Writing. However, with additional faculty, the program would like to develop a BFA.

Long-Range Planning—The Next Five Years

Our Successes: Goals Met in the Past Five Years
Few Literature programs have moved in the directions we have in the past five years. Our research, outlined in the above section, suggests that we remain part of the advance guard in undergraduate New Media Studies. Furthermore, our incorporation of technology and writing across our literary studies curriculum prepares all of our majors and minors for the creation and analysis of traditional and new media texts. One concrete piece of

evidence that suggests our program’s success is that since the fellowship program began in the Winter of 1986, sixteen Literature students have won the Distinguished Student Fellowship. Of those sixteen winners, eight of the recipients were awarded fellowships in the past five years (Appendix IV).

**Our Challenges: Meeting Demand While Maintaining Excellence**

It is worth repeating that in March of 2002 (during our last self-study), we had 179 majors. At that time, our outside reviewer suggested that we “hire two [additional] full-time faculty members as well as a full-time replacement for Professor Dunn” (Koster 11). By the fall of 2007, we will have fulfilled these hiring recommendations. Nathan Long was hired as a full-time replacement for Professor Dunn. The two Americanist lines (post-1865 and multi-ethnic literatures of the U.S.) will and have helped us meet the courses demanded for NJ Education standards and diversify our course offerings.

Strikingly, these new hires reflect needed resources when we had nearly one-half as many majors. Again, it is worth repeating that as of Fall 2006, there are 328 declared Literature majors. As a result, we expect that our current reviewer will find what our external reviewers have found for the past ten years: we are a vibrant and dedicated faculty failing to serve the needs of its students because there are too few Literature faculty.

Nancy Kaplan, the 1997 external reviewer, expressed serious concerns about our ability to service either our existing or new curriculum given the program’s allocation of faculty resources. For example, Kaplan found that despite students’ positive assessment of the faculty and the curriculum, they complained at length about course availability and the resulting difficulty they had “fulfill[ing] course requirements in an appropriate sequence or in a timely way” (8). Likewise, Josephine A. Koster, the 2002 reviewer, outlined the threat our number of majors-to-full-time faculty pose to our ability to serve our students well: “The chief threat to the continuing success of the LITT program is that of insufficient resources. There are too few faculty to offer all the necessary courses and maintain all the program’s current initiatives” (Koster 9). Even with half the number of majors we now have, Koster noted, “the LITT program lacks sadly behind other peer institutions in the state and region in the number of full-time faculty . . . And the students know this. Those I spoke with complained bitterly that there were not enough course offerings or courses offered at the time they could take them in their work schedules” (Koster 9).

In the face of these challenges, the program devised a plan that, with State, College, and Divisional support, will help us maintain distinction and foster growth. We also hope our outside reviewer will specifically comment on our three-course core and help us continue to think creatively about how to best serve our students.

**Our Goals and Plans: Obtaining Resources and Enhancing Strengths**

We believe that this document directly answers our past reviewer’s concerns. It reveals how, in the intervening five years, the program addressed the concerns the past reviewer expressed and the recommendations she urged in that 2002 review.
Still, despite the program’s best efforts, the key issue she and our 1997 reviewer raised remains. As the numbers suggest, even with the addition of the two new lines since our last self-study, the program’s faculty resources are stretched mighty thin. While we certainly appreciate the resources we have been given and will work hard to manage them effectively, we will continue to push for additional resources, particularly in the form of tenure-line faculty.

The request for new faculty poses a large challenge to the program, division, college and state budgets. In order to meet the college-wide faculty-student ratio of 17.4:1 and (assuming our current number of majors would only take two classes), the number of our full-time Literature faculty would have to double, from eight to sixteen.

328 majors x 2 classes = 656 needed seats / 16 faculty = 41 seats / 2 LITT classes per faculty member = average class size of 20.5 students/seats

These numbers assume that the program has stopped growing. As Table 1 illustrates, we have no data to support this assumption (our numbers keep increasing, not decreasing). We have no data that supports a downward trend or that indicates our number of majors has stabilized. In the January 10, 2007 transfer orientation meeting, we had roughly twenty-five transfer students join the program. Early Spring 2007 numbers indicate our number of majors are 334. Additionally, national trends suggest our enrollment will continue to grow. According to a September 2006 article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, “Enrollment at degree-granting colleges and universities is projected to increase until at least 2015, especially for minority students, according to a report released on Thursday by the National Center for Education Statistics, a branch of the U.S. Education Department” (Woo).

As noted above, this estimate of needed seats also does not account for courses in Creative Writing that generally have caps lower than twenty or the seat contributions of adjunct and associated faculty. Given the number of new transfer students and the projection for college enrollment to continue to increase, these estimates remain a conservative picture of our situation and what the next five years and more may hold.

To address our concerns we would like to see the addition of at least seven tenure-track faculty lines and two Visiting (13-D) positions created and supported by the Division, College, and State over the next five years. The addition of these lines would bring our full-time faculty to sixteen.

Not only would additional lines allow existing faculty more freedom to explore team-teaching possibilities, additional Literature faculty would add to and allow existing faculty to participate in the established Master of Arts in Education (MAED) program and developing initiatives such as the Master’s degree in American Studies and an Arts and Humanities BFA degree program.

The requested lines that follow outline a current picture of our needs. Of course, the two current faculty hires in New Media Studies and Multi-Ethnic Literatures of the United
States as well as any future hires, the order of those hires, and the changing shape of the field and our majors may alter this picture over the coming years. For example, depending on the growth of New Media Studies and the ways we might be able to connect this field productively in the future with the Communications (COMM) program, that area may eventually need another faculty line, specific to the Literature Program or as a joint hire in both COMM and LITT.

Additionally, while we understand the number of faculty lines requested is large, the program also feels our nearly fifty percent growth in majors over the past five years demands administrative response and commitment to action. Our majors have nearly doubled, and so why have our faculty numbers not done the same?

Our snapshots, furthermore, underscore the labor-intensive work demanded of our majors and our faculty. Simultaneously, our faculty research profiles are growing and expected to continue to increase in national profile, especially among our junior faculty as they work toward tenure and promotion. While the market is flush in literary studies Ph.D.’s and MFA’s, if our program expects to attract and retain the best teacher-researchers, we need to assure our faculty that they will have sufficient support. Obviously, junior and tenured faculty in other programs in the Division and across the College with fewer majors and substantially smaller classes have clear advantage over Literature faculty teaching full and over-enrolled sections with an average of 27 pages of formal writing assignments, intensive reading assignments, and innovative technology training. Furthermore, at the same time our already over-extended Literature faculty are also precepting a disproportionately large number of students.

In sum, the combination of these forces underscores the modesty of our requests for the following faculty lines:

**Requested Line 1: Creative Writing—Poet**

One of the program’s crucial needs is for a dedicated line in Creative Writing with a specialty in poetry. With only one full-time faculty member, the Creative Writing students have an especially difficult time scheduling classes. We provide, as best we can, a range of courses, a dedicated space for students to meet and share resources, opportunities to hear new voices in literature, and opportunities to publish their own work. However, the curriculum changes and use of adjunct and borrowed faculty still do not meet the demands of the track and its students. In addition, our advanced poetry faculty member could retire from teaching his course at any moment, further exacerbating the problem. Not only would a full-time poet benefit the Creative Writing track, but this faculty member could also contribute to our core program course offerings. Another creative writing faculty member could also help advance a BFA degree program.

**Requested Lines 2 & 3: World Literatures**

The recent trend to globalize and internationalize literary study is outlined above in the section “Trends in the Discipline.” While our current faculty stays abreast of this trend and incorporates global perspectives into their courses and course offerings, we also feel it is important to formalize and strengthen this area of study. We would like to add two
faculty members to our program who specialize in World Literatures, an area that represents a clear hole in our course offerings. One line, for example, could specialize in Western World Literatures and the other could specialize in Postcolonial or Non-Western World Literatures. The renaissance in this traditional specialty within Literature and Comparative Literature programs offers a unique opportunity to add an international presence to our program and campus. This person could also contribute to the American Studies and BFA programs that are being developed—helping to internationalize and globalize these programs.

Requested Lines 4: Grammar/Linguistics

Another hole in our faculty specialties is grammar/linguistics. This separate line could be jointly shared with the Education program, as the majority of the students who would take specialized courses on this topic would be pursuing elementary or secondary education certification after completing their Literature degree. For example, the State requires all secondary education majors highly qualified in English/Literature to take at least one course in grammar or linguistics. Grammar/Linguistics courses also fulfill ESL endorsement requirements. Ideally, all Literature/Education majors would take at least one grammar class. The Literature program sees such a position as an exciting opportunity to add and strengthen connections between these two programs and our shared students.

Requested Lines 5 & 6: Medieval and Renaissance British Literature

Prof. Tompkins is the only professor in our program trained in both Medieval and Renaissance literature; he regularly teaches “Shakespeare,” a required course for most of our majors. Today, scholars in these fields tend to specialize in either Renaissance or Medieval literature, not both. Whether Prof. Tompkins begins his transition to retirement in the next five or more years, the program needs specialists in both Medieval and Renaissance British literature. A Renaissance scholar, for example, would assist Prof. Tompkins and the program by offering more sections of “Shakespeare.” Hiring a Renaissance scholar prior to Prof. Tompkins’ retirement is crucial as the program needs to assure we offer “Shakespeare” on a regular basis. If we were to add a Medievalist prior to Prof. Tompkins’ retirement, we could also re-assess our program needs and use this established line to meet the program’s needs at that time.

Requested Line 7: Modern British/American Literature

The modern period represents an area our current tenured and tenure-track faculty lack specific specialty. We, along with our associated faculty, fill this gap as best we can. A specialist in this area of study would add needed courses on a regular and consistent basis. This faculty member could also contribute to the Division’s developing Master’s degree program in American Studies.

Requested Line 8: Creative Writing—Visiting Writer in Residence

This line could rotate every three years, specializing in poetry, fiction, playwriting, and/or hypertext/other electronic writing. The advantage of this full-time, rotating position is that it would periodically give students the chance to work with a greater variety of creative writers—an additional two for every four years of study. The visiting writer
would also enhance our Visiting Writers series by providing additional contacts to other writers and serving as one of the Visiting Writers each academic year. The Visiting Writer could assist the regular Stockton Literature faculty members (currently Nathan Long and Lisa Honaker) with the planning and execution of the Visiting Writers Series, a duty that currently carries no course release or additional pay.

Requested Line 9: Shared ARHU Visiting Professor
One possible creative solution that will not only assist our program but others within the division who also have experienced a strong increase in their numbers is to obtain a line for a shared visiting professor in ARHU. For example, the visiting professor might be a playwright who could work in both the Literature and Theater programs and contribute courses in both programs as well as perhaps have his/her own work produced and/or premiered at the college. Such a position could become an ARHU position that would rotate between programs for two or three year terms. For example, a playwright could be followed by a scholar of Atlantic Studies that might teach in Literature, Language, and/or History or contribute to the new American Studies program. A filmmaker/scholar or a New Media Studies specialist, furthermore, could contribute to Communications, the Visual Arts, and Literature. Such a position would allow the division to make the most use of limited funds for new faculty lines.

Requested Faculty Lines Summary
The above faculty lines represent one means of responding to the growth already experienced in the program and assuring the continued high quality of Literature specifically and Liberal Arts education more broadly at Stockton. The following goals and requests also outline the program’s plan to meet demand while maintaining excellence over the next five years and beyond.

Goal: Maintain Program Strengths & Current Faculty Lines
The program has clear commitments to maintain, and—if possible—enhance, the execution of the goals and objectives outlined in the first section of this document.

Should we not be granted the above lines, the Literature program faculty fear that the nature of Literature education at Stockton will change from an individualized and personal liberal arts experience within a close-knit community to an ever more frazzled and impersonal two or four years for our students. The College and our program risks students transferring to other institutions if they cannot register for needed courses in our program or if they cannot receive individual instruction and advising. The Literature program has assumed its fair share of the College’s growing pains for the past ten and especially five years; within the next five years we expect to work with Divisional and College administrators to assure and enhance the integrity of literary studies at Stockton.

Additionally, should any faculty members leave the college, the program would like to see those lines continue to be funded with tenure-track positions. Significantly, in this regard, Prof. Tompkins has been teaching a full course load (three courses) in Literature. Thus, when he decides to transition to retirement, the Literature program will lose two courses per year. Prof. Tompkins also regularly caps his classes at thirty-five. So, those
two courses represent a net loss of seventy seats per year. He also is the only professor in our program who is trained to teach both medieval literature and Shakespeare, a required course for many of our majors. Today, scholars in his field tend to specialize in either Shakespeare or Medieval literature, not both. Thus, his current position truly represents the work of two faculty lines—both in terms of specialty and number of courses offered within the Literature program. Whether Prof. Tompkins begins his transition to retirement in the next five or more years, the program would like the Division and College to recognize his current single line will require two faculty lines.

Goal: Smaller Classes
If our number of majors has reached it peak and is leveling off at about 325-350 majors, increasing our full-time program faculty by eight will make our number of majors more manageable. Our program faculty to majors ratio would be closer to 20:1, at least in terms of the number of seats we are able to offer.

Goal: BFA
The program is at the initial stages of discussing the possible development of an interdisciplinary BFA in the Arts and Humanities. We would like to join the other programs within the division of the Arts and Humanities that are developing BFA degree tracks. Like our current BA Literature majors, students in the BFA degree track might select a concentration in Literary Studies, Creative Writing, or New Media Studies. Unlike the traditional BA, the BFA would allow the student more focused study (more credit hours) within the major and division. One aspect stalling the development of this degree option is the ability to support such a degree with additional credit hour requirements with our current faculty resources. Before we can seriously develop, pursue, and support this long-term goal for a BFA we need commitments from the administration to support our current number of BA undergraduates with sufficient faculty lines.

Goal & Request: Support for Technology Outreach and Campus Technology Initiatives
The program remains committed to enhancing our outreach activities in the next five years. Given the heavy concentration students moving into education, the more alliances and connections we can make with local school systems the better it will be for our majors. The positive response to our “Language Arts Literacy Meets the Blog” workshop encourages us to continue this kind of outreach. The blogging workshop last summer suggested we have a lot to offer local teachers. They, in turn, have a lot to offer us in the way of information and opportunities for our students. All of us want to better educate the students we teach and serve the communities we live in. To this end, Tom Kinsella and Lisa Honaker (with the support and encouragement of the entire Literature faculty) hope to develop a grant for ARHU or the college for a blogging and middle schools program. The Literature program hopes college funding and support remains available for these types of outreach programs.

A dedicated computer lab for our instruction is also a priority for our program. New Media Studies classes as well as classes that require blogs and podcasting require regular access to computer lab space and computer applications. We could share this dedicated lab space with other programs in the Division of the Arts and Humanities; however, the
program needs dedicated lab space for classroom lab instruction and for student use for class homework.

Goal and Request: Support for and Increase Student Internships
While the support structure has been built for Internships in ARHU, too few Internships opportunities have been identified for Literature. This may improve with the hiring of the new full-time New Media Studies faculty member, but it is an issue that the entire Literature faculty and the Division’s staff should consider. Again, additional faculty lines would open more time for faculty—whether through a course release or through program service—to work on achieving this goal by building on the support structure and overseeing student internships.

Request: Support for Faculty Release Time
The division and college have been supportive of our faculty, granting releases for sabbaticals and leaves of absence. As the college continues to increase and improve its regional and national profile, more demands and opportunities for faculty research and development should be developed.

Currently, junior faculty are granted one course release during their first year. Tenured faculty are eligible to apply for sabbaticals in their seventh year. Divisional funds for junior faculty increase the program’s individual faculty research and travel budget ($600) by another $1000. Both junior and tenured faculty may apply for a limited number of competitive summer grants, usually valued at $3900. The acting program coordinator receives one course release per year in compensation for his/her duties. The person who writes the program’s five-year self-study document also receives one course release.

The program would like to know from our outsider reviewer how well Stockton’s research and development monies and release time compare with other programs with similar teaching, advising, and research expectations (both pre- and post- tenure). Given the constraints on our time, the opportunity for more release time without significant decrease in pay would help us better recruit and retain our faculty.

Request: Greater Equity in Faculty Precepting Duties
The program understands our majors would like to work closely with Literature faculty. The program remains committed to serving all of its majors well in this regard. The implementation of the Banner system promises to reduce some of the paperwork and student guesswork—once students can conduct their own graduation audits and track their progress in the degree—that often takes a great deal of our time when we meet with students.

Inequity in precepting duties represents a significant issue for Literature faculty because it impacts the time we have available to conduct other work, including our other teaching, service, and research obligations. The program would like to see more action at the Divisional and College levels to achieve greater equity among programs and precepting duties. Distributing our majors to other faculty with fewer majors provides some relief, but often we end up advising those students informally or taking on additional students
who understandably requests that a Literature faculty member to serve as his/her mentor and advisor. Release time and/or monetary compensation offer other possible solutions that would reward faculty who precept students beyond a specific number.

Request: Stable Budget

We need a stable budget so that we can seriously plan from one year to the next. Our proposed budgets have seldom been met and the recent fluctuations in funding support have made it difficult to begin a range of initiatives, including (but not limited to) the following:

- Enhancing New Media Studies, specifically a dedicated computer lab and other hardware and software
- Supporting end-of-year prizes
- Encouraging work study in support of faculty research
- Encouraging and institutionalizing speakers series: Deborah Gussman and Lisa Honaker have contacted a speaker on Emily Dickinson and the digital humanities for spring
- BFA in Creative Writing

Summary of Goals and Requests

More faculty lines and support for faculty release time would allow the program to build and increase its strengths. The program faculty have a great deal of energy and creative projects we would like to pursue. For example, this report has already outlined the program’s groundbreaking technology initiatives. One way to draw on faculty strengths would be to combine the study of book history and new media studies. At Stockton we have the expertise to highlight these relationships. We might consider a student sponsored, student conference on “The Medium of the Text.” We could draw from the developing book history programs at Rutgers, Camden and Drew and the New Media initiatives throughout the state. Such a conference would increase our State and national profile. It could also help create energy and interest in the proposed American Studies M.A. and developing BFA programs. However, without adequate support, the program cannot in good conscious take time away from teaching and precepting to advance such initiatives.

We will continue to think imaginatively about how to address the challenges our program faces. We will also continue to build our strengths. Our research and the evidence gathered here suggest that our program’s curriculum engages in key best practices for undergraduate liberal arts education. Appendix A of the American Association of Colleges and Universities’ “College Learning for the New Global Century: A Report from the National Leadership Council for Liberal Education America’s Promise” includes “A Guide to Effective Educational Practices.” Out of the ten suggested practices, our program serves our students and the College by contributing to at least seven of these essential objectives:

1) We provide a “Common Intellectual Experience” for our students through our core curriculum;
2) We ask students to complete “Collaborative Assignments and Projects” in “Introduction to Literary Research” (the hypertext
3) We provide “Writing Intensive Courses” through our demanding paper assessments;
4) We encourage “Diversity/Global Learning” through our commitment to and practice of assigning diverse literatures;
5) We increasingly include “service learning/community based learning” in our program’s coursework;
6) We provide “Internship” opportunities for our majors and minors; and
7) We require “Capstone Courses and Projects” through our “Senior Seminar” course.

As our numbers have grown, we have also worked hard to maintain and build “Learning Communities” for our students, another key active learning practice encouraged by the Council. Our annual “Bash” is a testament to the important social aspects of building a strong learning community. Select students, furthermore, conduct “Science as Science Is Done/Undergraduate Research” with Literature professors by completing independent study projects. Our plans for the immediate future are to continue to follow these effective education practices.

**Summary of Requested Feedback by Outsider Reviewer**

The Literature program seeks comments on all facets of our program. In particular, we would like the reviewer to provide specific feedback on the following topics:

1) Our curriculum, specifically how it compares nationally: the core, the tracks, and the balance/depth of courses we offer
2) Our number of majors and full-time Literature faculty
3) Whether faculty research support and release time appears adequate for a 3/3 state college and the tenure and promotion requirements
4) Whether our library and technical support appears adequate
5) Our faculty line requests, specifically if these requests would position us where we need to be

**Works Cited**


Appendices

Appendix I: Flint “Senior Seminar” Assessment Report
To: Deborah Gussman, Literature Program Coordinator
From: Holly Flint, Outside Evaluator
Re: Student Papers and Grading Rubric for the Dickens Senior Seminar
Date: 20 June 2006

The grading rubric designed and used for the Dickens Senior Seminar is both effective and well constructed. The descriptions of the levels of achievement for specific areas of student performance effectively guided me through what I assume are Stockton’s standards for evaluating literature essays. As such I predict that instructors who use the rubric should be able to maintain a fairly high level of grading consistency across several dissimilar Senior Seminars.

To encourage such consistency, I would therefore suggest that the rubric’s formatting be developed such that the descriptions of the levels of achievement appear in the same order for each letter grade. Currently, for example, the entry regarding “the central point or thesis” in the “A” description is listed fifth; under “B” it is listed sixth. Furthermore, I would suggest that each letter grade, including the “D” and “F” sections, have a complete “checkable” list of descriptions. (Please note: I am attaching a revision reflective of these changes to better illustrate my recommendations.)

My first recommendation should further facilitate instructors’ use of the rubric while helping them reduce potentially confusing clerical mistakes (e.g., accidentally assigning both an A and a B to the same characteristic). The second recommendation should allow instructors to provide a more nuanced evaluation of submitted papers, such that students who submit, for example, a “B” paper that contains transitions reflective of “D” level work could be informed of their poor performance in one area but still receive a grade reflective of their paper’s overall quality.

In addition, I recommend the addition of two “checkable” entries relating specifically to the areas of (a) originality of reading/interpretation and (b) MLA citation style. Regarding the first suggested addition, while undergraduate students are often unable to produce fully-developed, innovative readings of texts during the course of one semester, it seems that students should be applauded and rewarded for their ability to read relevant criticism and identify new and exciting areas of interpretation to explore. Regarding the second recommendation, adding an entry reflecting citation quality (e.g., an entry that would allow the instructor to indicate that particular students consistently failed to correctly introduce quotations) would help reinforce an area of technique for which, as evidenced by the previous grader’s markings, students are being held accountable. While an entry currently exists regarding “research [that] is…well documented,” adding an entry specifically relating to the MLA citation style would solidify this expectation. Likewise, I recommend that you develop the wording of the entry regarding “the writer’s rhetorical stance” such that the students might better understand the components of this
stance (e.g., appropriately targeted audience, demonstrated awareness of critical context, establishment of exigency, etc.).

Also, although I was not provided with a “used” rubric, I would suggest you add a small section/area as a designated space where the instructor could give a final comment in response to the paper. This space would allow the instructor to convey extra praise for particular ideas and techniques that a student might have worked to develop throughout the semester. I would also allow the instructor to inform the student of specific argumentation and/or writing techniques that might require immediate development.

In response to your request that I comment on the strengths and weaknesses of the papers provided, I would first like to say that the seminar’s primary assessment strategy (which I assume was an assignment that asked students to complete an annotated bibliography followed by a 20-page research paper presenting a well-developed reading of two or more of Dickens’s works and incorporating relevant criticism and theory) is appropriate to the level of the course and ideal for guiding students through the process of developing their own voices as literary critics.

With the exception of a few cases, the papers reflect that most of those who completed the class can now lay claim to a quite thorough knowledge of Dickens’s oeuvre, an accomplishment that reflects well on both the students and the instructor. Also, based on the papers’ incorporation of secondary critical sources, most students seem to have gained and/or developed their ability to read, understand, reference, and engage literary criticism. For those students planning to enter the field of secondary education, this too seems an appropriate and laudable course goal.

The only critique I would offer is that the group of papers evidenced a strong tendency to preference biographical criticism. Although this preference in and of itself is unproblematic, I would suggest that students be encouraged to explore other schools of criticism while researching and writing their papers. In addition, there also seems to be a tendency for students to advance their reading/interpretation of Dickens’s work by way of providing evidence that Dickens himself intended such a reading/interpretation. Again, while students’ investment in authorial intentionality is neither uncommon nor problematic, I would suggest that they be encouraged to consider the implications of this critical assumption, which may occur “organically” if the students were to read and cite essays written from a broader range of critical perspectives.

Below, then, is a list of the grades I have assigned the papers you forwarded and attached is an edited version of the rubric that reflects my initial recommendations regarding document formatting and development. If you would like further explanation of either the grades I have assigned or the recommendation I made above, please let me know.

**Paper Grades:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II: Guidelines for Internships for Literature Majors

**Guidelines for Internships for Literature Majors**

An internship, as distinguished from an independent study, is defined as program-related employment, paid or non-paid, for credit – usually but not necessarily external to the Stockton community.

1) Interested students can learn about internship possibilities by contacting the Internship Coordinator – currently Lisa Donato – in the ARHU Office, K-150.

2) Interested students should contact a LITT faculty member and ask whether he or she is willing to act as sponsor for an internship.

3) Having the sponsorship of a LITT faculty member, students must notify the ARHU Internship Coordinator of their intention to pursue an internship during the upcoming semester.

4) The Internship Coordinator will explain the paperwork needed to commence and document an internship. All pertinent paperwork must be completed before the internship can begin. Gathering proposals and permissions may take several weeks, so plan accordingly.

**The Details**

To be eligible for internships, students must have a minimum GPA of 2.5 and have successfully completed at least 64 college credits (at least 16 at Stockton). Internships can be taken pass/fail or for a letter grade.

Before the internship is approved for credit (1 to 4 credits), the student must submit a proposal, signed by the prospective employer, that specifies the scope, expectations, and methodologies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Student M</th>
<th>B+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Student N</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student C</td>
<td>C+</td>
<td>Student O</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student D</td>
<td>B+</td>
<td>Student P</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student E</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Student Q</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student F</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Student R</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student G</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Student S</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student H</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Student T</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student I</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Student U</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student J</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>Student V</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student K</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student L</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
involved in the internship, to his/her LITT faculty sponsor. A copy must also be provided to the Internship Coordinator.

Students must facilitate the completion of Stockton’s Affiliation Agreement between the college and internship site. Copies are available from the Internship Coordinator.

Students must complete Independent Study forms (available from the Internship Coordinator) with sponsoring LITT faculty and pay the appropriate amount of tuition to the College.

It is expected that students undertaking a 4-credit internship will accumulate 120 hours over the course of a semester (8 x 15). Total hours may include time for independent research and writing, determined in consultation with the LITT faculty sponsor.

During the course of the internship, students must submit to the Internship Coordinator bi-monthly time-sheets/progress reports (forms available from the Internship Coordinator) attested to by the confirming signature of the employer.

Near the conclusion of the internship, the Internship Coordinator will mail evaluation forms to employers requesting a detailed evaluation of the student’s performance. This form is returned to the Internship Coordinator, who will make copies of the letter and bi-monthly time sheets/progress reports available to the sponsoring LITT faculty.

At the end of internships students must submit a portfolio of work and a culminating project agreed upon by the LITT faculty sponsor. These projects normally describe what the student accomplished and learned as a result of this employment.

Students may take no more than 8 credits in LITT internships, excepting students who apply for the Washington Internship. Simultaneous or consecutive internships will require special permission/approval.

A final note

Any full-time LITT faculty can act as a sponsoring LITT faculty member. Please note, however, that Professor Kinsella has signaled his willingness to work with students seeking internships. The sponsoring LITT faculty member must check the student’s GPA and credit level before agreeing to sponsor the internship. The faculty member is also expected to periodically interact with the student during the internship by e-mail or in person. Sponsoring faculty members may require additional obligations, such as periodic weblog or journal entries.

Appendix III: Library Resources

General Description of the Library—October 2006

The Richard Stockton College Library serves the college community as well as residents of New Jersey. In the fall of 2006, undergraduate enrollments numbered 6,727 and graduate enrollments numbered 486, for a total of 7,035 students. There are 261.5 full-time equivalent faculty positions, as well as a varying number of adjunct faculty members. There are currently 24,874 registered borrowers in the library’s patron database. The library has 9 professional and 16
paraprofessional staff members, and approximately 20 part-time, temporary and student staff members.

The library selects, acquires, catalogs, and makes available print, electronic, microform, and media resources in support of the academic programs and the general information needs of the college community. The collection contains:

| Current periodical subscriptions – paper | 1,112 |
| Bound periodical volumes               | 33,612 |
| Access to paper and electronic full-text periodicals | 22,949 |
| Books - paper                          | 229,617 |
| Access to electronic books             | 1,800  |
| Government documents – paper           | 347,500 |
| Government documents – microform       | 436,300 |
| Media                                 | 14,293 |
| Microform                             | 712,200 |
| Bound index and abstract volumes      | 10,149 |
| Access to electronic databases        | 57     |

The total number of physical items in the collection is 1,783,671. This is calculated to be approximately 794,000 Bound Volume Equivalents.

The amount spent to acquire print materials, media and databases in FY 2006 was $860,670. Last year the library added 5,486 new titles to the collection. In FY 2007, the acquisition budget is $868,000. Access to electronic databases and resources is expanded every year. The library is a depository for Federal, New Jersey, and the Pinelands Commission documents. It also houses the college archives.

The library is open to the public 89 hours per week. Information Desk service is provided 85 hours per week. All of the library’s Web-based electronic resources are available from external locations at any time for affiliated users.

Library instruction and information literacy training are provided through full-credit courses in the freshman seminar program and through individual classes taught by librarians. Last year 2,660 students received library instruction.

Print materials needed by students and faculty but not owned by the library are available through interlibrary loan. Last year library users obtained 3,574 items from other libraries through this service.

The following charts provide additional information about the library’s budget.

Table 34: Library Materials Cost Attribution by Program–FY 2006
This details, by division and program, library expenditures for each category of acquisition. Approval and firm orders are books. Continuations are serials, usually annuals. Media includes
DVD, videotape and music CD. Periodicals include all paper subscriptions. Two categories that are not represented in this file are database costs and book binding costs.

### Library Materials Cost Attribution by Program - FY 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Firm Order</th>
<th>Continuations</th>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Periodicals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARTP ARHU</td>
<td>$1,822.72</td>
<td>$1,542.91</td>
<td>$37.46</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$2,090.96</td>
<td>$5,494.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTV ARHU</td>
<td>$6,603.07</td>
<td>$1,544.57</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$5,430.22</td>
<td>$13,577.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM ARHU</td>
<td>$3,190.36</td>
<td>$1,928.78</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$40.01</td>
<td>$1,748.02</td>
<td>$6,907.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST ARHU</td>
<td>$10,191.91</td>
<td>$4,142.48</td>
<td>$284.00</td>
<td>$1,795.45</td>
<td>$9,231.75</td>
<td>$25,645.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANG ARHU</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$2,931.78</td>
<td>$2,931.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITT ARHU</td>
<td>$3,714.51</td>
<td>$1,775.56</td>
<td>$11,238.50</td>
<td>$198.86</td>
<td>$3,341.35</td>
<td>$20,268.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAHG ARHU</td>
<td>$602.75</td>
<td>$2,143.95</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$327.32</td>
<td>$922.47</td>
<td>$16,056.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL ARHU</td>
<td>$3,782.67</td>
<td>$7,696.57</td>
<td>$54.90</td>
<td>$32.15</td>
<td>$4,490.48</td>
<td>$16,056.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARHU-Genl. ARHU</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$787.61</td>
<td>$787.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,907.99</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,774.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>$11,614.86</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,393.79</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,974.64</strong></td>
<td><strong>$95,666.10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Af-AmerSt GENS</td>
<td>$2,614.43</td>
<td>$899.66</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$657.89</td>
<td>$1,549.22</td>
<td>$5,721.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JewishSt. GENS</td>
<td>$1,880.75</td>
<td>$1,308.59</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$32.75</td>
<td>$940.01</td>
<td>$4,162.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WomensSt. GENS</td>
<td>$2,095.70</td>
<td>$382.50</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$1,906.16</td>
<td>$888.04</td>
<td>$5,272.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENS-Genl.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$278.02</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,590.75</strong></td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td><strong>$3,655.29</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,433.72</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOL NAMS</td>
<td>$5,516.42</td>
<td>$3,222.38</td>
<td>$95.00</td>
<td>$34.20</td>
<td>$51,550.00</td>
<td>$60,418.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM NAMS</td>
<td>$403.35</td>
<td>$3,616.36</td>
<td>$139.95</td>
<td>$207.96</td>
<td>$28,148.09</td>
<td>$32,515.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVL NAMS</td>
<td>$7,143.10</td>
<td>$6,651.68</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$272.93</td>
<td>$29,688.66</td>
<td>$43,756.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEOL NAMS</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$13,403.97</td>
<td>$13,403.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARS NAMS</td>
<td>$365.02</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$21,956.98</td>
<td>$22,367.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH NAMS</td>
<td>$954.23</td>
<td>$3,876.37</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$54.95</td>
<td>$15,777.52</td>
<td>$20,663.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHYS NAMS</td>
<td>$1,677.51</td>
<td>$2,407.77</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$232.41</td>
<td>$14,865.00</td>
<td>$19,182.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAMS-Genl. NAMS</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$7,283.78</td>
<td>$7,283.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$16,059.63</strong></td>
<td><strong>$19,819.56</strong></td>
<td><strong>$234.95</strong></td>
<td><strong>$802.45</strong></td>
<td><strong>$182,674.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$219,590.59</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSNS PROS</td>
<td>$5,956.50</td>
<td>$572.91</td>
<td>$8,448.20</td>
<td>$1,601.07</td>
<td>$20,249.67</td>
<td>$36,828.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIS PROS</td>
<td>$591.20</td>
<td>$2,077.70</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$6,353.35</td>
<td>$9,004.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC PROS</td>
<td>$1,312.80</td>
<td>$955.95</td>
<td>$354.40</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$6,648.84</td>
<td>$9,271.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIT PROS</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$529.16</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$6,001.88</td>
<td>$6,531.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT PROS</td>
<td>$43.35</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$4,476.08</td>
<td>$4,519.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPT PROS</td>
<td>$281.02</td>
<td>$1,271.64</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$15,588.24</td>
<td>$17,140.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS PROS</td>
<td>$2,839.40</td>
<td>$1,472.85</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$969.04</td>
<td>$18,218.95</td>
<td>$23,500.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBH PROS</td>
<td>$2,044.31</td>
<td>$732.37</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$203.71</td>
<td>$9,258.39</td>
<td>$12,238.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAD PROS</td>
<td>$107.71</td>
<td>$49.48</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$5,664.84</td>
<td>$5,824.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEACH PROS</td>
<td>$1,752.53</td>
<td>$406.42</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$2,158.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROS-Genl. PROS</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$466.45</td>
<td>$2,471.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,928.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,068.48</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,269.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,773.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>$94,915.57</strong></td>
<td><strong>$129,955.74</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIM SOBL</td>
<td>$2,166.57</td>
<td>$784.40</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$9,778.56</td>
<td>$12,729.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECON SOBL</td>
<td>$4,207.69</td>
<td>$1,820.83</td>
<td>$724.20</td>
<td>$20.29</td>
<td>$14,868.83</td>
<td>$21,641.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS SOBL</td>
<td>$7,913.80</td>
<td>$755.09</td>
<td>$840.90</td>
<td>-$</td>
<td>$12,008.80</td>
<td>$21,518.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Periodical Allocation Formula FY ‘07

This document was created by the Library Committee to begin allocating the acquisitions budget using quantitative data. It was applied to periodical subscriptions only for FY 2005. The two factors are a weighted student FTE for each program and the average cost of periodicals in the related subject area. The plan is to apply the formula over a four year period. The adjustment targets for FY 2005 are reflected in the last column. Subscription additions and cancellations were made in consultation with faculty members in every program. See Appendix V.

Table 35: Book Collection Growth by Program – Number of New Titles Added

This table shows the number of book titles added to the library collection in support of each program over the last six years. It is important to note that from FY 2000–FY 2003, a few titles were attributed to two programs because of the inter-disciplinary nature of the work. In FY 2004, we changed that practice and began attributing each title to only one program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSIS</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>81</th>
<th>57</th>
<th>63</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>67</th>
<th>395</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAIT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPT</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURS</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBH</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAD</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>6050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOBL</th>
<th>CRIM</th>
<th>117</th>
<th>143</th>
<th>142</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>74</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>642</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CRIM</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLS</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYC</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>913</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCY</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>1731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOWK</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1391</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>6477</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ARHU</td>
<td>2872</td>
<td>2994</td>
<td>2207</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>1607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENS</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>794</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAMS</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROS</td>
<td>1335</td>
<td>1326</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOBL</td>
<td>1391</td>
<td>1216</td>
<td>1097</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>1042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7383</td>
<td>7227</td>
<td>5726</td>
<td>4033</td>
<td>4359</td>
<td>4342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ELECTRONIC DATABASES:** providing access to articles & abstracts in literature journals

- Academic Search Premier
- Contemporary Authors
- JSTOR
- Literature Resource Center
- MLA Bibliography (internet)
- OmniFile Full Text Mega (HUMANITIES)
- Project Muse

**Table 36: PERIODICAL HOLDINGS**

The following periodicals in print or microform are available in the Library to support the Literature Program

**TITLE**

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY
AMERICAN LITERARY HISTORY
AMERICAN LITERARY REALISM, 1870-1910
AMERICAN LITERATURE
AMERICAN POETRY REVIEW
ANALES DE LA LITERATURA ESPANOLA CONTEMPORANEA
ANQ
BELOIT POETRY JOURNAL
BEST AMERICAN SHORT STORIES (Circulating Collection)
CHAUCER REVIEW
CLASSICAL JOURNAL
CLASSICAL QUARTERLY
COMPARATIVE LITERATURE
CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE
CRITICISM
DAEDALUS
ELH: ENGLISH LITERARY HISTORY
ENGLISH JOURNAL
ENGLISH LANGUAGE NOTES
ENGLISH LITERATURE IN TRANSITION, 1880-1920
ESQ: A JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN RENAISSANCE
ESSAYS IN CRITICISM
ESSAYS IN THEATRE
EXPLICATOR
FICTION
GENRE
HOLLINS CRITIC
HUDSON REVIEW
INTERPRETATION
JOURNAL OF AMERICAN FOLKFOLKLORE
JOURNAL OF FOLKFOLKLORE RESEARCH
JOURNAL OF MODERN LITERATURE
JOURNAL OF NARRATIVE THEORY
MODERN FICTION STUDIES
NEW ENGLAND REVIEW
NEW LITERARY HISTORY
NINETEENTH-CENTURY LITERATURE
NOVEL
PARIS REVIEW
POETRY
PRAIRIE Schooner
RARITAN
ROMANCE NOTES
SHAKESPEARE QUARTERLY
SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY
SOUTHERN REVIEW
STUDIES IN ENGLISH LITERATURE
STUDIES IN SHORT FICTION
STUDIES IN TWENTIETH CENTURY LITERATURE (changed to Studies in 20th & 21st Century Litt)
STUDIES IN 20th & 21st CENTURY LITERATURE
TLS: TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT
TWENTIETH CENTURY LITERATURE
VICTORIAN POETRY
VICTORIAN STUDIES
WORLD LITERATURE TODAY
YALE REVIEW

Online Literature Journals
In addition to the on-site periodicals listed above, Stockton students have access to over 250 journals online either through our electronic databases or the Stockton Electronic Journal List: http://fx5ly8ju5l.search.serialssolutions.com/?V=1.0&L=FX5LY8JU5L&N=100&S=SC&C=080090
Appendix IV: Stockton Board of Trustees Fellowships for Distinguished Students

Since the program was implemented in fall of 1986, the following students have received Fellowship awards: 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Period</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter - 1986</td>
<td>Fina, Frances</td>
<td>Examination of Convenience Store Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smellegar, Lori J.</td>
<td>Raman Scattering in Focused Geometry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wochner, Lee</td>
<td>One-act Play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Edsall-Tracy, Mary</td>
<td>Dance Performance Training in Limon Technique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer - 1987</td>
<td>DeSteno, Patricia</td>
<td>Women Suffrage in Barnegat, New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaudet, Mary</td>
<td>A Survey of The Non-Traditional Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harrington, Barbara</td>
<td>Audition/Monologue Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mahoney, Allison</td>
<td>Audience Effects and Chronic Pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter - 1987</td>
<td>Stuck, Richard</td>
<td>Geochemical Survey of Igneous Rocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer - 1988</td>
<td>Krishnamoorthy, Venu</td>
<td>A checkout system for the Library Media Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moore, Gerry</td>
<td>The flora of Cumberland County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter - 1988</td>
<td>Blair, Adriane</td>
<td>Peer-Mentor Program for Minority Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day, Bernard</td>
<td>Weather Station at SSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diehl, Marilyn</td>
<td>Gender &amp; Employment in Casinos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moore, Gerry</td>
<td>Plant-Micranthemum Micranthoides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring - 1989</td>
<td>Cross, Gregory</td>
<td>Integrating Writing, Word Processing, &amp; Desktop Publishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DiMauro, Lisa</td>
<td>Diamondback Terrapin Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nastro, Frank</td>
<td>Robotic Locomotion and Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rush, Thomas</td>
<td>Wittig Synthesis of Testosterone Propionate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter - 1989</td>
<td>Augustine, Karen</td>
<td>Diagnosis of Pathogenic Viruses in Shellfish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collins, Gregory</td>
<td>Computers and Music in the Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mercogliana, Catherine</td>
<td>Mineral Intergrowths in Upper Mantle Rocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring - 1990</td>
<td>Andresen, Celeste</td>
<td>Oceanographic Research Cruise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graziano, John</td>
<td>Short Stories - Lost Generations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohn, Bruce</td>
<td>Conservation of Diamondback Terrapins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weems, Richard</td>
<td>Book - Pleasantvile, Maryland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter - 1990</td>
<td>Cox, Phyllis</td>
<td>Family Conflict and the Homosexuality Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cuconati, Andrea</td>
<td>Neoteny Level in the Axolotl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenamoyer, Jennifer</td>
<td>Measurement of Dissolved Oxygen at SSC lab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thames, Gregory</td>
<td>Isolation and Purification of Bacterial TGF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring - 1991</td>
<td>Antolino, Eileen</td>
<td>Wetlands as a Waste-Water Treatment Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hollar, Beth</td>
<td>Mathematics for Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter - 1991</td>
<td>Gove, Jonnie</td>
<td>Analysis of fossil Leatherback Turtles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hood, Sharon</td>
<td>Herbarium at SSC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 Literature students are noted in red.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring - 1992</td>
<td>Breen, Robert</td>
<td>Psychology of Gambling Behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hannity, Laura</td>
<td>Campus Environment Impact Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LaMazza, Antonietta</td>
<td>Solubilizing of G-proteins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McMenamin, Michelle</td>
<td>Learning Strategies for Physics Courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waterman, David</td>
<td>Film on Seatbelt Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter - 1992</td>
<td>Bolderman, Mark</td>
<td>Theatre Troupe Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MacMahan, James</td>
<td>Database on Delaware Estuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ruble, David</td>
<td>Water Circulation in Great Bay of New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring - 1993</td>
<td>Miteva, Billiana</td>
<td>Environmental Degradation and Cultural Dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poshka, Christina</td>
<td>Public Service Announcements on Drugs and Alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solomon, Erika</td>
<td>Proteins in Duckweed Following Toxic Exposure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter - 1993</td>
<td>Olsen, Cheryl</td>
<td>Library Collections Analysis - Asian Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wagar, Jonathan</td>
<td>Plant Survey - Cape May Lowland Swamps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring - 1994</td>
<td>Erskine, William</td>
<td>Auto Racing in Depression Era South Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jones, Janice</td>
<td>Survey of Non-traditional Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kim, Thomas</td>
<td>Metals &amp; Phosphates in <em>Neurospora crassa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nichols, Susan</td>
<td>Spider Crabs in Great Bay, New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wood, Craig</td>
<td>Terrapins &amp; Crabs Captured in Commercial Crab Pots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall - 1994</td>
<td>Basic, Zelkas</td>
<td>Vacuolar Functions of <em>Neurospora crassa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maltzman, Ian</td>
<td>Housing Video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Szymanski, Mark</td>
<td>Over winter Mortality of <em>Fundulus heteroclitus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring - 1995</td>
<td>Alvarez, Joseph</td>
<td>Propagation of Pineland Species for Horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connelly, Jessica</td>
<td>Isolating Vacuolar Mutants in <em>Neurospora crassa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jones, Christopher</td>
<td>Lysine &amp; Ornithine Uptake in <em>Neurospora crassa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miteva, Billiana</td>
<td>Geomorphology in Oaxaca, Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wills, Shannon</td>
<td>Prehistoric Shell Middens and Indicator Plant Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall - 1995</td>
<td>Brown, Tarah</td>
<td>The Hummingbirds of Costa Rica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Munafo, John</td>
<td>Flammulin from Medicinal Fungi <em>Flammulina velutipes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Smiljanic, Sanjin</td>
<td>Interfacing Ada and C Programming Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tonetta, Tracie</td>
<td>Photo Documentary - Biology of Tropical Ecosystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring - 1996</td>
<td>Chassels, Marla</td>
<td>Analysis of Park Management - Zimbabwe and Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hansen, Sandra</td>
<td>Genetic Markers in Dune Grass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Johnson, Jeff</td>
<td><em>Solitaire - A One Act Absurdist Play</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reighn, Sharon</td>
<td>Osteocalcin and Glucocorticoid Actions in Relation to Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Celestino, Michael</td>
<td>Japanese Shore Crab, <em>Hemigrapsus sanguineus</em>, in NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderski, David</td>
<td>The Mano Machine - A Computer Simulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steck, Kerriynn</td>
<td>Tree-Throw as Alternate Explanation for Pit House Depressions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring – 1997</td>
<td>Berry, Kathleen</td>
<td>Marketing of Medicare HMO's in New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Godin, Jason</td>
<td>Biological Nitrogen Fixation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oviedo, Hysell</td>
<td>Neuron Circuitry From <em>Loligo vulgaris</em> (squid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platt, Thomas</td>
<td>Symbolism and Gender Relations in Mexican Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romano, John</td>
<td>Fault Block Rotation Using Paleomagnetics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall – 1997</td>
<td><strong>Cruzan, Benjamin</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Village Taxonomy, A Novella</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nachiappan, Chidambaram</td>
<td>Toxicity Study and Breeding of Poison Dart Frogs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oviedo, Hysell</td>
<td>Pattern Formation/Functionality of Complex Systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riley, James</td>
<td>Fermat’s Last Theorem-Greatest Solved Mathematical Problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp, Jessica</td>
<td>Isolation and Cloning of 6-Phosphogluconate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szlanic, Barbara</td>
<td>Proust, Gautier and Intertextuality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring – 1998</td>
<td><strong>Harmstead, Jenna</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem Solving - Role of Group Effectiveness Training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iacovelli, Josh</td>
<td>The New Stockton Summer Theatre Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin, Heather</td>
<td>Oral History of the Richard Stockton College of NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seymour, Michelle</td>
<td>Analysis of Corporate Management Practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabekman, Yevgeniy</td>
<td>Computer Searches in Artificial Intelligence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West, June</td>
<td>A Bird As Free As Me – Memories of South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall – 1998</td>
<td><strong>Bartley, Christopher</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Graphics With Fractal Geometry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodey, Stephen</td>
<td>Economic Impact of Richard Stockton College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peery, Christopher</td>
<td>Investigation and Experiment in Robotics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams, Bridgette</td>
<td>&quot;What I Can Do With A Major In Biology&quot; booklet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring – 1999</td>
<td><strong>Boettger, Lori</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Three Inter-related Short Stories on Domestic Violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooke, Brian</td>
<td>New Jersey and Israel: Perfect Together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd, David</td>
<td>The Myth of Chryssor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Faith</td>
<td>Infants At Risk For Malnutrition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roth, P. Helen</td>
<td>Improving Outreach Of Breastfeeding Support In Our Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall – 1999</td>
<td><strong>Gregory Canellis</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wobbelin and Hagenow: The Forgotten Camps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Chancellor</td>
<td>Chaos in a Duffing Oscillator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Gessner</td>
<td>Germany, Recycling, and the Green Dot Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Hurd</td>
<td>Molecular Genetic Approach to Conservation of <em>Arethusa bulbosa</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Johnson</td>
<td>Sexual Dimorphism in the Pelvis of the American Mastodon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Law</td>
<td>Genetic Manipulation of Nitrogen Fixing Bacteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring - 2000</td>
<td><strong>Paula Roberson</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Fieldwork in Education-South Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Strack</td>
<td>Design Principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall - 2000</td>
<td><strong>Elizabeth Miller</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Search for the Holy Grail Course</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheri Black</td>
<td>Holocaust Survivors and the Second Generation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring – 2001</td>
<td><strong>Lauren Kisiel</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listen to the Children: School Violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vera Povolina</td>
<td>Effects of Aging on Immune System Function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Shanahan</td>
<td>Behavioral Ecology of Cliff Swallows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadine Sullivan</td>
<td>Life Histories of Gay Evangelicals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring – 2002</td>
<td><strong>Umar Ashfaq</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characterization of Efflux of Amino Acids From Vacuoles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall – 2001</td>
<td><strong>Dina Bower</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nitrate Monitoring at the NJ State Aquarium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra Vance</td>
<td>Expression of a Cloned Soybean Gene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring – 2002</td>
<td><strong>Umar Ashfaq</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characterization of Efflux of Amino Acids From Vacuoles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Matthew Gettings  
Vacuolar Efflux in *Neurospora crassa* Due To Change in Proteins?

James House  
DNA Fingerprinting of Pineland Microbial Communities

Jennifer McPoyle  
Northern Diamondback Terrapin Conservation Project

Joshua Raclaw  
Effect of Tongue Piercings on Production of American English Phonemes

**Fall – 2002**  
EvaMarie DiGiorgio  
Away, With Words: A Study In Poetry

Robert Gorecki  
Effect of pH Growth of Ironcolor Shiners, *Notropis chaelybaeus*

Gale Johnston  
Carnivorous Plants on Our Stockton Campus

Joanna Woerner  
Road Kills: Analysis of Long-Term Trends

**Spring – 2003**  
Seth Abbott  
The Rose Rechnic Story: Tell The World

Christopher Borino  
The New Minstrels

Katherine Burke  
Writing for the Future: An Introduction to College Writing

Tara Fayter  
The Role of Service Learning in Promoting Civic Engagement

Amy Lassen  
Paleo-Environmental Reconstruction Using Soils & Archaeological Data

**Fall – 2003**  
Lauren Buyofsky  
Comparison of Heavy Metals in Atlantic County Surface Water

William Errickson  
Antimicrobial and Antifungal Properties of Native Plant Species

John Macaluso  
Route to Chaos Theory I

Kathleen Werner  
Miss America Pageant Instructional Video

**Spring – 2004**  
Laura Birchler  
The Placebo Effect – Short Stories

Debra Franzese  
Sexual Harassment Law: Title IX and State Legislation

Alicia Guarracino  
Collection of Poems About Grandmother Laura Guarracino

Nancy Price  
Role of Calcium Oxalate as a Defense Against Predation

**Fall – 2004**  
Jason Hoger  
Growth Comparison of Insect Supplemented versus non-insect supplemented diets in *Drosera capensis* (cape sundew)

Meaghan Bernier  
Predicting Tree Diversity from Growing Season Patterns in Photosynthesis with a Satellite Driven Model

Sean Maycock  
Unity Composition Mural

**Spring – 2005**  
Jenny Hussong  
Tracking Turtles Underwater

Jonathan Sedeyn  
Terrapin Inhabited Water Characterization Study

**Fall-2005**  
Paul M. Porter Jr.  
The Formidable Poincare’ Conjecture On the Brink? Of an Amazing Proof

**Spring – 2006**  
Johanna Crawford  
Caribbean Women: A Father Figure in Patriarchal Society A Comparative Study of Jamaican and Puerto Rican Women’s Roles

Maureen Egan  
In My Life

Alissa Laurito  
Impact of Humans on the Environment using Paleo-environmental Reconstruction in Oaxaca, Mexico

Lisa Longo  
“Once Upon a Time: a Collection of Adapted Fairytales”

Mark McNulty  
Late Pleistocene Coastal Settlement of Central Portugal Survey

Kirsten Pelton  
Modern Germany and the Holocaust: Responsibility, Remembrance, and Commemoration

Lucia Pou-Nickas  
Reconstructing the Ancient Environment of the Ancient Highlands of Oaxaca using Geologic and Archeological Data
Appendix V: Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty CVs

Deborah Gussman, Assoc. Prof., American Literature

DEBORAH GUSSMAN

Arts and Humanities, K-150
The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey
Pomona, NJ 08240-0195
Tel. (609) 652-4657
619 Wayne Avenue
Haddonfield, NJ 08033
Tel. (856) 795-6585
deborah.gussman@stockton.edu

EDUCATION

Ph.D. 1993   Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, Department of English.
Area of Concentration: Nineteenth Century American Literature
Minor Area: Women’s Literature and Gender Studies
Dissertation: "Remembering Plymouth Rock: The Making of Citizenship in Nineteenth-
Century Narratives of Colonial New England."

M.A. 1987   Rutgers University, Department of English.

B.A. 1984   Temple University, Philadelphia, PA. Major: English; graduated Magna Cum Laude and
in the University Honors Program. Study Abroad: Temple University Rome, August-

TEACHING AND ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION

Literature Program Coordinator, The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey, Pomona, NJ: 2004-
2006.

Associate Professor of American Literature, The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey,

Literature courses taught:
- American Drama
- American Literature before 1865
- American Literature since 1865
- American Romanticism
- American Short Story
- American Women Writers
- Contemporary American Fiction
- Early American Literature
- The Great American Novel
- Introduction to Literature
- Introduction to Research in Literature
- Literary Methodologies
- Literature by Women
- Native North American Indian Literature
- Senior Seminar: Autobiographical Acts
- Senior Seminar: Literary Influence and Intertextuality
Senior projects, independent studies, and internships supervised:
- Directing a One-Act Play (Susan Glaspell; Bertold Brecht)
- Nathaniel Hawthorne’s Short Fiction
- Nineteenth-Century American Indian Literature
- Representations of Dentistry in Literature
- Staging the Holocaust
- Teaching Early American Literature in the High School Curriculum
- Writing Internship (*Soap Opera Digest*, New York, NY)

General Studies courses taught:
- Cultural Memory and the Vietnam War
- Perspectives on Women
- Rhetoric & Composition (GEN 1120)
- Rhetoric & Composition: Freshman Seminar (GEN 1020)
- Close Reading Culture: Freshman Seminar (GEN 1023)
- Seminar in Feminist Theory (GIS, scheduled for Spring 07)


**Chair, Department of Arts and Humanities**, Mount Vernon College, Washington, DC: 1997-1998. Reported directly to President as part of Academic Leadership team; supervised 25 full and part-time faculty in seven undergraduate majors; created departmental policies and procedures; coordinated academic scheduling and student advising with registrar's office; approved course-related expenditures; planned departmental meetings and events.

**Assistant Professor of English and American Studies**, Mount Vernon College: 1993-1998. Courses taught: African-American Literature; American Culture and Identity in the Global Context; American Drama; American Literature to 1865; American Literature since 1865; American Novel; American Drama; English Composition; Honors English Seminar; Introduction to American Studies; Internship in Arts and Humanities; Literature by Women; Senior Seminar in Arts and Humanities; Writing for Careers.

**Teaching Assistant**, Writing Program and English Department, Rutgers University: 1986-1991. Courses taught: Composition and Reading Skills; Developmental Composition; Expository Writing; Introduction to Fiction; Twentieth-Century American Fiction.


**Coordinator and Instructor in Writing**, Educational Opportunity Fund's summer college program, Rutgers University: 1988, 1989. Supervised four writing instructors; designed and implemented peer tutoring sessions. Courses taught: Composition and Reading Skills; Writing and Biology.
TEACHING AND RESEARCH INTERESTS

American Literature and Culture; Constructions of Identity--Gender, Race, Class, Sex, and Nation; Multi-Ethnic Literature of the US; Native American Literature and Culture; Nineteenth-Century Women Writers; Rhetorical Approaches to Composition and Literature; Weblogs and Virtual Communities.

PUBLICATIONS


Reviews and Miscellaneous Writings


PAPERS AND PRESENTATIONS


"Romancing the Revolution and Revolutionizing the Romance in Nineteenth-Century Fiction.”

"Fettered or Free?: The Politics of Marriage in Sedgwick, Carey, and Blake,” Catharine Maria Sedgwick Symposium, Stockbridge, MA, June 2003.


“Feminism, Administration, and (Pro)Creation,” Conference On College Composition and Communication, Minneapolis, MN, April 2000.


"Remembering In America," Chair, Session on American Literature to 1865, M/MLA Convention, St. Louis, MO, November 1995.


"The Cultural Work of Pequot Conversion Narratives." Frederick Douglass Commemorative Centennial, West Chester University, West Chester, PA, October 1994.
"Story-telling and Story-listening with Basic Writers," (with Anne Herzog), Conference on College Composition and Communication, Seattle, WA, March 1989.
"Within the Educational Apparatus: Ideology and Student Writing," (with Mollie Brodsky), Literacy Conference, University of San Francisco, June 1988.

**HONORS AND AWARDS**

Baccalaureate Speaker (elected by Senior Class), Mount Vernon College: May 1997.
Faculty Development Grant, Mount Vernon College, Fall 1994.
Faculty Development Grant, Mount Vernon College: Fall 1993.
New Jersey Department of Higher Education Curriculum Development Grant in Women’s Studies, Rutgers University, 1989.
Catherine Musello Cantalupo Prize for Best Essay on Literature and Religion, English Department, Rutgers University: 1989.
Summer Fellowship, New Jersey Center for the Study of Writing, Rutgers University: 1987.

**RELATED EXPERIENCE**

Faculty Mentor, Teaching Portfolio Project, Consortium of Colleges and Universities, Washington, DC: 1995-1996. Completed training and worked with Mount Vernon College faculty to create portfolios for enhancing teaching and for evaluation.
Research associate, Walt Whitman Center for the Culture and Politics of Democracy, Rutgers

**ACADEMIC SERVICE**

**Richard Stockton College**

*College-wide and Divisional committees:*
- New Faculty Mentor (Rita Mulholland, EDUC)
- Faculty Advisory Committee for Education, Spring 2006-present.
- Faculty Assembly Ad Hoc Committee on the Day of Scholarship, 2005-06.
- Distinguished Faculty Fellowship Committee, Spring 2005.
- Interim Dean Search Committee, ARHU, Spring 2005
- MAED Faculty Search Committee, Spring 2004
- Master of Arts in Education Curriculum Committee, Spring 2003-Spring 2004
- Convener, General Arts and Humanities (GAH) Committee, Fall 2001-Spring 2003
- General Studies Committee, Fall 2001-2003
- Day of Scholarship Committee, Fall 2001-Spring 2003
- Academic Policy Committee, Fall 2000-Spring 2002

*Literature program:*
- Chair, Multi-Ethnic Literature of the US faculty search committee, Fall 2006-
- Faculty Advisor, Sigma Tau Delta (International English Honor Society), Fall 2006-
- Faculty Advisor, Idols of the Tribe (Literature Club), Spring 2006-
- New Media Studies adjunct faculty search committee, Spring 2006
- Chair, American Literature faculty search committee, Fall 2004-Spring 2005
- Reader for Creative Writing awards, Literature Program, Spring 2005
- Curriculum committee, Spring 2002-present
- Program web-page committee, Summer 2002
- New Media Studies faculty search committee, Spring 2002
- Wrote Assessment Self Study for program’s 5-year review, Spring 2002
- New Media Studies track committee, Summer 2000
- Reader for Virginia Woolf Prize, Spring 2001 and Spring 2002
- Handbook for Literature Majors committee, Spring 2000
- Reader for Fyte-Armstrong Prize, Literature Program, December 1999
- Preceptor for Literature majors and minors (approx. 50 students/term), ongoing

*Women’s Studies program:*
- Invited speaker, Women’s History Month Opening Ceremony, Spring 2005
- Invited panelist, Women’s Coalition roundtable discussion on the Presidential Election, Fall 2004.
- Chair, Curriculum Committee, Fall 2003-Spring 2006
- Assessment Sub-committee for Self-Study, Fall 2003-Spring 2004
- Student handbook committee, Spring 2002
- Panel organizer, Women’s History Month Film Festival, Spring 2001
- Faculty Mentor, Women’s Studies Senior Project, Spring 2001
- Perspectives on Women course review committee, Fall 2000-Fall 2001
- Preceptor for Women’s Studies minors, ongoing
National:
- Pedagogy and Teaching committee, Association for the Study of American Indian Literature, 2005-present.
- Blind reviewer for Sedgwick Society-sponsored ALA panel, Spring 2005
- Peer Reviewer, *Studies in Puritan American Spirituality*, 2004
- Peer Reviewer, Broadview Press, 2004
- Founding member, Catharine Maria Sedgwick Society, 1997
- Advisory and Nominating Committee, Section on American Literature to 1870, M/MLA, 1996-1999.


**PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

American Literature Association; Association for the Study of American Indian Literatures; Catharine Maria Sedgwick Society; Modern Language Association; National Council of Teachers of English; Nineteenth Century American Women Writer’s Reading Group; Society for the Study of American Women Writers.

**INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY**


Web site: http://caxton.stockton.edu/bookish

References furnished upon request.
Lisa Honaker, Assoc. Prof., 19th and 20th century British Literature

Lisa Honaker
56 Pine Avenue
Freehold, New Jersey 07728
(732) 761-0015
e-mail: Lisa.Honaker@stockton.edu
homepage: http://caxton.stockton.edu/blueskies/

Education:

1993 Ph.D., English, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ.
   Dissertation: “Reviving Romance: Gender, Genre, and the Late-Victorian Anti-Realists”
1981 B.A., with highest honors, English, University of Illinois, Chicago.

Teaching and Research:

1995-present: Associate Professor in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century British Literature at The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey. Program courses taught include: Introduction to Literature, Literary Methodologies, Introduction to Literary Research, British Literature II, Literature and Imperialism, Detective Fiction, Victorian Literature, The Brontes, Turn of the Century Novel, Modern British Novel, Contemporary British Fiction, The Novel and Empire (senior seminar), Hardy and Conrad (senior seminar), Novel into Film (senior seminar), The British Romantics. General Studies courses taught include: Rhetoric and Composition, Experience of Literature, Horror Literature and Film.

1995: Associate Director in the Rutgers Writing Program. Duties included teaching literature and composition courses and developing and administering grants for the English department.

1994: Copy Editor, Kallir, Philips, Ross, 333 East 38th St., New York, New York. KPR is medical advertising agency. Duties included proofreading and editing copy generated for various clients’ print ad campaigns as well as sales materials and displays.

1992-93: Instructor to Assistant Professor (Visiting) in Nineteenth-Century Literature at Fordham University. Courses taught included: Introduction to Literature, Great Texts, Romantic Period I and II, Turn of the Century (British Fiction), Late-Victorian Romance (seminar).


1987-89: Research assistant to Professor Myra Jehlen in American Literature.
1982-87: Teaching assistant and visiting part-time lecturer in the composition and literature programs at Rutgers University. Courses taught included: Freshman Composition, Basic Composition (remedial), Major British Writers: Blake to the present, Introduction to Literary Study, Contemporary Fiction.

1986-87: Instructor in English in the Educational Opportunity Fund six-week summer program, Douglass College.

**Teaching Interests:**

Victorian Literature, The British Romantics, British Modernism, Contemporary British Fiction, American Literature, History of the Novel, Genre Theory, Gender Studies, Popular Culture.

**Works-in-Progress:**

“Revenge of a Gothic Gnome: *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde* and the ‘Re-vision’ of Late-Victorian Romance” (Under preparation for submission to *Studies in the Novel* or another peer-reviewed journal).

**Publications:**


Teacher's Manual for *Effective Writing for the College Curriculum*.


**Papers and Presentations:**


"Coming Out of Hyde-ing: the Romance of *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*," Rutgers Graduate English Symposium, April 1988 and NEMLA, Wilmington, Delaware, April 1989.


**Miscellaneous:**

Reviewed proposal for potential Broadview Press edition of Charlotte Bronte’s *The Professor* (Simon Avery, editor).

Honors and Awards:

2002: Research and Professional Development Fellowship, The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey

1989-90: Louis Bevier Graduate Fellowship.

1988: Rutgers Graduate School Excellence Fellowship.

1988: Catherine Moynahan Prize (for best graduate student essay, delivered at annual Rutgers Graduate English Symposium).


Grants:

1995: George M. Ohl Foundation Grant for Rutgers-University/University of Maryland Summer Institute for Secondary School Teachers

Academic Service:

2006-2007: Co-coordinator, Visiting Writers Series, Richard Stockton College of New Jersey

2006-present: Director, Political Engagement Project, Richard Stockton College of New Jersey

2005: Coordinator, Creative Writing Awards; Reader, Jeannette Harron Gottlieb Award for Poetry, Michael J. Lanza Award for Poetry, R.J. Corradino Award for Love Poetry, Richard Stockton College of New Jersey.


2004-present: Director, Odyssey Project, a collaborative endeavor with the Richard Stockton College of New Jersey, the New York Times, and three New Jersey High Schools.

2003-2004: Faculty participant in Odyssey Project.


2001: Five-Year Post-Tenure Faculty Assessment Committee, Richard Stockton College of New Jersey.

2001: Mentor to Christine Farina in New Faculty/Mentor Program, Richard Stockton College of New Jersey.
2000-2001: Chair, Distinguished Faculty Fellowship Committee, Richard Stockton College of New Jersey.


1998: South Jersey Summit on Graduate Education, April 15, Rutgers University, Camden, New Jersey.


1996-97: Committee for revision of Literature/Language Program Curriculum, Richard Stockton College of New Jersey.


1993-94: Steering Committee for proposed Symposium Series and Conference on Cultural Studies, sponsored by Fordham University, Rose Hill and Lincoln Center Campuses.

1990: Steering Committee for Popular Culture Conference sponsored by the Center for the Critical Analysis of Contemporary Culture, Rutgers University.

1985 1989: Organizer for annual Graduate Student Symposium, Rutgers University.

1984-85: Student representative on Graduate Program Committee, Rutgers University.

1983-84: Curriculum committees for Rutgers University freshman composition and basic composition courses.
Community Service:

1994-98: Lecturer and discussion leader for Perth Amboy Women's Club reading group

Languages: Reading knowledge of French.

References available upon request.

References:

Barry V. Qualls  
FAS, Dean of Humanities  
Rutgers University  
New Brunswick, NJ 08901  
732-932-8194

Thomas Kinsella  
Associate Professor, British Literature  
The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey  
Pomona, NJ 08240  
609-652-4419

Deborah Gussman  
Assistant Professor, American Literature  
The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey  
Pomona, NJ 08240  
609-652-4657

Beth Olsen  
Grants Officer  
The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey  
Pomona, NJ 08240  
609-652-4939

Robert King  
Professor, Business Law  
The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey  
Pomona, NJ 08240  
609-652-4483
Kristin J. Jacobson, Asst. Prof., American Literature

Kristin J. Jacobson

Home
610 East Lakefront Circle
Galloway, NJ 08205
(609) 748-3396

Work
The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey
Arts and Humanities, K-150, PO Box 195
Pomona, NJ 08240-0195
(609) 626-5581

Kristin.Jacobson@stockton.edu
Professional Homepage: http://loki.stockton.edu/~jacobsok/index.html

ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF AMERICAN LITERATURE
The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey, Pomona, NJ August 2005 to present

Current Book Project: Domestic Geographies: Neodomestic American Fiction
What happened to nineteenth-century domestic fiction? Rather than disappearing forever as a result of the advent of new modernist forms and the rise of the new woman, domestic fiction, I argue, is undergoing a renaissance in the late twentieth century. Incorporating feminist geography and literary analysis, my interdisciplinary project investigates late twentieth-century and early twenty-first-century manifestations of what I call “neo-domestic fiction.” I identify three signature tropes that define domestic fiction in this revised form: relational space, renovation and redesign of the interior or exterior of the home, and domestic mobility. To determine domestic fiction’s continued place of importance within American literature and culture I consider works as various as Toni Morrison’s Paradise, Leslie Marmon Silko’s Gardens in the Dunes, and Chang-rae Lee’s A Gesture Life. In addition, I consider the ways in which domestic fiction remains a gendered, raced, and classed genre. As domestic fiction has traditionally been defined as white, middle-class, Protestant women’s literature, my project explores how such paradigms remain key to understanding this “recycled” genre. The project appraises the literary and social consequences of how both female and male American writers map the space of the home. I conclude that the use of particular gendered tropes—rather than a simple identification of an author’s gender—best unpacks the politics of this “women’s fiction” and, by implication, of the gendered, raced, and classed space of the American home. Significantly, while both male and female writers write neo-domestic fiction, women writers such as Barbara Kingsolver, Loida Marita Pérez, Sandra Cisneros, and Marilynne Robinson occupy the forefront of this visionary and revolutionary work focused on redesigning the American home.

EDUCATION

Ph.D.–English, Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA, August 2004
Graduate Minor: Women’s Studies
Teaching with Technology Certificate


B.A.–English, summa cum laude, English and All College Honors, Carthage College, Kenosha, WI, 1995
PUBLICATIONS


TEACHING EXPERIENCE

40 SECTIONS

Stockton College–Pomona, NJ, Assistant Professor: Fall 2005-to present

- **LITT 4610: Senior Seminar—American Postmodern Fiction.** 31 students
  This course surveyed a range of postmodern American fiction, conducted close readings of the texts’ aesthetic constructions and politics, and examined the fiction’s cultural and historical contexts. We also read critical essays to help frame our understanding of this period and its literature. The capstone project provided advanced literature students the opportunity to plan, prepare, write, and present a substantive individual research project.

- **LITT 3217: Special Topics in American Literature—Contemporary Domestic Fiction.** 30 students:
  This class explored the construction of domestic fictions’ gendered identities in the late twentieth century and early twenty-first century by surveying domestic novels written by both men and women. We also considered whether or not there are distinctly gendered ways of writing about the home in contemporary American fiction.

- **LITT 2145: Domestic Dramas.** 27 students
  This course surveys various kinds of “domestic dramas,” such as plays, soap operas, novels, and films. We examine how various popular and literary texts use the domestic sphere to reflect and shape individual and national identities. We will consider what defines a domestic drama—its generic characteristics—as well as the politics of domesticity.

- **LITT 2109: Contemporary American Fiction—(Post)Colonial Perspectives.** 30 students.
  The course surveyed fiction written within the last ten years that (re)considers American colonial, global, and/or transnational powers.

- **LITT 2105: American Literature II 1865-Present.** 30 students:
  What does it mean to be an American? What themes and authors best define American literature? What do our criteria tell us about our own values? To address such questions this course surveyed significant works of fiction, nonfiction, and poetry from the late nineteenth century to the contemporary period. A cacophony of voices provided opportunities to discuss American *ideals* as well as American *realities*.

- **LITT 1101: Literary Methodologies—A Literary Toolbox.** 30 students.
  This core course provides students with a toolbox of skills and approaches to literature. A key skill students practice in this course is how to produce close readings of texts. The course also enhances students’ electronic literacy through the production and analysis of a variety of electronic texts. All students are required to construct a weblog.

- **GAH 2256: American Popular Culture and Folklore.** 30 students
  Arranged as a “road trip,” this course gave students an opportunity to tour rural, urban, extreme, and cyber
popular and folk cultures. Texts included novels, essays, poetry, fan writing, web pages, documentaries, films, television, and music.

- **GAH 1051: The Body Across Disciplines.** 24 students
  This is a team-taught class involved many hands-on daily class activities, including body movement (yoga, theater exercise, group movement, meditation, etc.), writing, performance, art, oral presentations, and role playing. Students gained experience in critical thinking and writing, conducting library research, creating surveys, and expressing themselves creatively and physically. First-year seminar co-taught with Nathan Long.

Penn State–University Park  
Fall 1999–Summer 2005

- **English 436: American Fiction Post-1945—Literary Geographies.** 40 students
  What is the relationship between place and post-1945 American fiction? The course addressed this question by examining American literature’s cultural and aesthetic geographies.

- **English 435: American Short Story.** 40 students
  Beginning with Washington Irving’s “Rip Van Winkle” and concluding with Ursula K. Le Guin’s “Texts” and a comparison between Andre Dubus’ “Killings” and its cinematic adaptation, *In the Bedroom*, this course examined the short story’s place within American literary history and the ways writers have used the short story form to create a unique literary vision of America. We conducted close readings supplemented with essays examining the relationships between the stories, authors, and their literary and social contexts.

- **English 003: Great Traditions in American Literature.** 60 students
  This course was designed as a set of three, individually chronological units that surveyed literature from the colonial to modern periods and that identified as well as questioned literature’s “great traditions.” To locate “greatness” in an American context, unit one examined various, competing literary definitions of America and “great” literature. Unit two covered the “lesser” regional and folk traditions alongside the “higher” traditions of modernism and postmodernism. The final unit examined America’s literary protest tradition.

- **English/Women’s Studies 194: Women’s Fiction.** 60 students
  Focused on the novel written by women, this class examined what defines women’s literature beyond an author’s gender. Four themes helped organize this investigation into the attitudes and tropes commonly found within women’s fiction: (1) sentimentalism and the attitudes toward “scribbling women,” (2) haunting and grotesque bodies, (3) the domestic sphere and gendered space, and (4) gender and mobility.

- **Women’s Studies 001: Introduction to Women’s Studies.** 60 students
  This interdisciplinary survey mapped the field of Women’s Studies by tracing women’s landmark relationships with the home, work, the city, mobility, nation, and the environment. Texts from literature, film, history, psychology, sociology, and the natural sciences included Barbara Neely’s mystery *Blanche Cleans Up* and *Real Women Have Curves*. Trained and supervised the undergraduate teaching assistant.

- **American Studies 105: American Popular Culture and Folklife.** 100 students
  This course was arranged as a “road trip” that gave students an opportunity to tour rural, urban, extreme, and cyber popular and folk cultures. Texts included novels, essays, poetry, fan writing, web pages, documentaries, films, television, and music. Trained and supervised the undergraduate teaching assistants.

- **English 015: Rhetoric and Composition.** 24 students
  A required first-year course that emphasized rhetorical analysis, cultural analysis, and the development of rhetorical skill with an emphasis on audience and argument.
English 202B: Advanced Rhetoric and Composition: Writing in the Humanities. 24 students
An upper-division course for humanities majors that enables them to develop critical thinking and composition skills, my course focused on disciplinary literacies and the components of a liberal arts education.

English 004: Basic Writing. 15 students
Designed for students who lack confidence in their writing and rhetorical skill, the course provided intensive practice in writing sentences and paragraphs and instruction in grammar, usage, and punctuation.

English 005: Tutoring.
One-on-one weekly tutoring supplement for undergraduates offered by the university’s Writing Center.

**Beijing, China–International Program**

Summer 1999

English 1020 Core Composition I. 30 students
Core English undergraduate composition class at the Beijing International College. Chinese students in this program earned credit abroad toward a University of Colorado undergraduate degree. Extensive ESL teaching experience.

**Community College of Denver, tutor:**

Spring 1998–Spring 1999
Tutored writing and computer skills as well as conducted writing center orientations to community college, Metro State, and University of Colorado-Denver students, including GED, ESL, vocational, undergraduate, and graduate students. I also worked as an on-line writing tutor, and I wrote and helped design a letters webpage for the writing center homepage: http://owl.ccd.cccoes.edu/owl/letters/.

**University of CO-Denver**

Fall 1997 & 1998

English 4190: Reading and Writing About Popular Culture. 35 students
The course introduced critical approaches to popular culture, including Marxism, feminism, psychoanalysis, and poststructuralism.

English 1601: Telling Tales: Narrative Art in Literature and Film. 35 students
Focused on examining and comparing race and gender “stories;” the course introduced and compared narrative’s literary and cinematic formal aspects.

**University of CO-Boulder**

Spring 1997

English 3312: Bible As Literature. 75 students
Assisted Dr. Thom Lyons by grading papers and exams and meeting with students.

**SELECTED PRESENTATIONS**


ACADEMIC & PROFESSIONAL SERVICE & TRAINING

Manuscript Reader for Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts, Fall 2005.

Teaching with Technology Certificate, Pennsylvania State University, August 2004: Rigorous certification program that requires the development of a web portfolio demonstrating the use of technology in the classroom and reflection on technology’s pedagogical impact.

Manuscript Reader for Tulsa Studies in Women’s Literature, Fall 2003.

AWARDS


The Richard Stockton College Divisional Research and Professional Development Grant, 2005: Award given to Arts and Humanities junior faculty for travel to conferences and research.
Thomas Kinsella, Assoc. Prof., 17th and 18th century British Literature

Thomas E. Kinsella  
Associate Professor of British Literature

The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey  
Division of Arts & Humanities  
Pomona, N. J. 08240-0195  
(609) 652-4419  
kinsella@earthlink.net

Academic Position

Associate Professor of British Literature, The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey. Associate Professor from September 1999 to present; Assistant Professor from September 1989 to August 1999.

Education

Ph.D., 1989, The University of Pennsylvania  

Publications


**Bookbinding Exhibitions, Seminars & Research**


Assistant to Willman Spawn, Honorary Curator of Bookbinding, Bryn Mawr College, for the exhibition *It’s the Ticket: Nineteenth-Century Bookbinding in the British Isles and United States*. Exhibited September 23, 1998 through May 1999 at the Mariam Coffin Canaday Library, Bryn Mawr College. Wrote all copy and assisted in all preparations for the exhibition.


Guest speaker at bibliographical seminar in the history of books and printing sponsored by the Department of Philosophy at The University of Pennsylvania, October 6, 1993. Speaking to graduate students and faculty about the history of bookbinding.


Graduate Student Assistant, researching bookbinding history and recording significant examples in Special Collections, Van Pelt Library, University of Pennsylvania, October 1985-May 1989.

**Reviews**


http://www.victorianweb.org/art/design/books/king/kinsella.html


Conference papers, Conference Service


Chair of Presentation Panel: “Readers and Reading,” College English Association, 36th Annual Convention, Cincinnati, Ohio, April 1, 2005.


Reports, Proposals, Pamphlets

Coordinator’s Report: Literature Program, 2003-2004. Reported program activities during the school year; successfully argued for an additional line for Literature program; articulated plans for the future.


Coordinator’s Report: Literature and Language Program, 1992. Reported on program activities during the past year and articulated plans for the future.

Five Year Program Review: Literature and Language Program, Stockton State College, 1992. Coordinated the gathering of materials, solicited outside evaluators, and authored major portions of the state-mandated program review.


Teaching Experience

Courses taught at The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey

General Studies courses: Argument and Persuasion, Celtic Mythology & Early Irish Literature, Irish History and Culture, Medieval Ireland, Narrative and Writing, Rhetoric and Composition, Writing about Literature, Writing in the Electronic Age.

Courses taught at The University of Pennsylvania (1984-1988)

Upper Level English (9th through 12th grade), taught at The Hill School Summer Program for Advanced Study, Pottstown, Pa., June 26-July 30, 1988.

Selected Hypertexts


Language Arts Literacy Meets the Blog! Technology in the LAL Classroom. This site supports the efforts of the Literature program at Stockton College in providing up-to-date and useful materials on electronic literacies to New Jersey K-12 educators. Begun August 2006. http://caxton.stockton.edu/edblogs/about

The Richard Stockton Text Project. Students enrolled in Introduction to Literary Research at Stockton College study selected texts, annotate them, and then place them on the web. I initiated this project in 2000 and have overseen several projects, as have my colleagues Lisa Honaker and Deborah Gussman. http://loki.stockton.edu/~kinsellt/projects.html


Description of a fifteenth-century manuscript at the University of Pennsylvania, including bibliographical, comparative, historical, and theoretical discussions. WWW since May 1995.

http://loki.stockton.edu/~kinsellt/litresources/binding/latin13/intro.html

Homepage on the World Wide Web (since October 1994). Links to current course work, web-page resources, weblog documentation, and the work of Literature Program students on the web: http://loki.stockton.edu/~kinsellt/one.html

**Academic Distinction & Funding**


Distinguished Faculty Fellowship for Research in New Teaching and Learning Strategies; for development of course that teaches writing using Internet, computer conferencing, and text-based virtual reality programs (MOOs), The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey, Spring 1994. The resulting course, Writing in the Electronic Age, was taught 9 times from Fall 1994 through Fall 2001.


Computer Research Grant to study the use of computer labs within campus residential housing, University of Pennsylvania and Apple Computers, Inc., 1988-1989.


Distinction, Master’s Examination, University of Pennsylvania, 1983.

College Service

At The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey
Coordinator of the Literature Program, September 2006-.
Member of Research and Professional Development Committee, Fall 2004-Spring 2006.
Member of the Honors Program Steering Committee, Fall 2004 – Spring 2006.
Member of Faculty Assembly ad hoc committee to develop a proposal for an Honors Program at Stockton, October 2003 – March 2004.
Member of Faculty Assembly ad hoc committee to develop a proposal for the Masters of Arts in Education program at Stockton, January – October 2003.
Co-Chair of the “Faculty” subcommittee of the Middle States Institutional Self Study, 2001.
Member of College Wide Personnel Committee, representing the Division of Arts and Humanities, October 1999-September 2003.
Member of Web Task Force reviewing and recommending software for web-based distance education, April-June 2000.
Member of Faculty Assembly ad hoc committee reviewing distance education, 1999.
Member of Research and Professional Development Committee, SFT delegate, Spring 1999.
Member of Arts & Humanities Tenure and Reappointment Committee, 1997-1998.
Representative for Arts & Humanities on Faculty Assembly Steering Committee,
Member of Arts & Humanities Tenure and Reappointment Committee, 1994-1995.
Recorder for Faculty Assembly, Fall 1994-Spring 1995.
Member of Arts & Humanities Task Force for the development of Math Across the Curriculum, Fall 1993-Fall 1994.
Member of Research and Professional Development Committee, September 1991-May 1993.
Member of Distinguished Faculty Fellowships Committee, 1990-1991.
Member of Library Advisory Committee, September 1990-May 1994.
Member of Writing Advisory Committee, 1990.
Participant at grading of the biannual Junior Writing Test, Fall 1989 to its termination in 1994.
Participant in CoSy and WebCaucus (computer conferencing systems) from their initial implementation at Stockton College, Fall 1989, to present.

Membership on search committees
New Media Studies Candidate, one year replacement position, Spring 2006.
Dean of Arts and Humanities, Spring, 2005-Spring 2006.
American Literature Candidate, Fall 2004-Spring 2005.
Creative Writing Candidate, Fall 2004-Spring 2005.
Reading Specialist, Masters of Arts in Education program, Fall 2004-Spring 2006 (two searches: the first was a failed search).
Creative Writing Candidate, one-year position, Spring 2004, chair.
Language Arts Literacy candidate, Masters of Arts in Education program, Fall 2003 – Spring 2004.
Creative Writing Candidate, Spring 2003.
Media Writing candidate, Spring 2002.
One-semester British Literature candidate, Fall 2001.
American Literature candidate, Spring 1999, Chair.
Director of Teacher Education Program, Summer 1997.
British Literature candidate, Fall 1995, Chair.
Director of Institute for Research in Teaching and Learning, Fall 1995.
One-year British Literature candidate, Summer 1995, Chair.
Communications Studies candidate, Spring 1994.
Communications Studies candidate, Fall 1991-Spring 1993 (serving on three consecutive committees).
Communications Studies candidate, Spring and Summer 1990.
Selected Activities

Moderator of the Literature and Medicine reading group at AtlantiCare Mainland Hospital, an NEH and NJCH sponsored project that fosters connections between doctors, nurses, hospital administrators, and staff through monthly discussions of literature. December 2006-June 2007.

Organized and presented at “Language Arts Literacy Meets the Blog! Technology in the LAL Classroom.” A pre-workshop presented by the Literature Program at Stockton College for local area 7-12 teachers. We discussed pedagogical uses of weblogs and podcasting in the language arts classroom. August 22, 2006.


Participant, Literacy Volunteers of America, Cape - Atlantic, Inc. 1 Community Spelling Bee, September 7, 1996.

Guest speaker to the Gifted and Talented program, Reeds Road School, February 22, 1995. Speaking with Andrea Wells’ fifth-grade class on “Who Was Shakespeare (and how do we know)?”


“Renaissance Italian Book Structures,” Stockton State College Faculty Works in Progress Talk, 18 February 1993.

Member of The University of Pennsylvania Library Committee, 1987-89.


Attended Rare Book School, University of Virginia, March 2000; Columbia University, Summers of 1986 and 1987.

**Library and Book Club Memberships**

- Friends of Rare Book School, University of Virginia, since 2005.
- Member of Philobiblon Club of Philadelphia, since 2004.
- Member of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, since 2000.
- Friends of the Bryn Mawr Library, since 1993.
- Friends of the Library, Bucknell University, since 1986.

**Recommendations**

Daniel Traister, Curator of Special Collections, Van Pelt Library, University of Pennsylvania.

Willman Spawn, Honorary Curator of Bookbindings, Bryn Mawr College.

Kenneth Tompkins, Professor of Literature, The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey.

Deborah Gussman, Associate Professor of American Literature, The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey.
Nathan Long, Asst. Prof., Creative Writing

Nathan Alling Long
3689 Eveline St. Philadelphia, PA 19129
ruminate2@yahoo.com

Education

M.F.A., Creative Writing, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA, 1999
M.A., English (Cultural Studies), Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, 1989
B.A., English, High Honors, cum Laude, U. of Maryland, College Park, MD, 1986

Positions Held

Assistant Professor, Creative Writing, Richard Stockton College, Pomona, NJ, fall 2005-present
Assistant Professor, English, Virginia Union University, Richmond, VA, 1999-2004
Instructor, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond (VCU), VA, 1996-1997
Instructor, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, TN, 1993-95

Writing Workshops

Creative Writing Workshop, MALT educational center, Philadelphia, PA, spring & fall, 2006
Fiction Workshop, Virginia Writers’ Conference, University of Richmond, VA, March 2001-2004
Creative Non-Fiction Workshop, Lost State Writers’ Conference, Greensboro, TN, October 2003
Fiction/Playwriting/Poetry Workshops, Richmond “Writers-in-the-Schools“ program, 1998-2003
• over a dozen writing workshops, ranging from 1 to 8 sessions
Fiction Workshop, Hurston/Wright Foundation’s Academy for Emerging Writers, fall 2000
Advanced Fiction Workshop (teaching assistant), VCU, spring 1999
Playwriting: Richmond in the 1930’s (teaching assistant), VCU, fall 1998

Creative Publications

“Superstition,” sonnet, Places, Voices, Landscapes, Culture (anthology), ed. Jacqueline
McLean, forthcoming
“The Dog” and “The Last Hot Day of Summer,” chapbook, Popular Ink Press, December, 2006
“Tracking,” short story in *Mother Knows* (anthology), Washington Square Press, 2004
“Christmas” and “The Origin of Doubts,” two shorts, *Salt Hill*, winter 2003/4
“Eight Short Memories about Sex,” poems, *Borderlands*, summer 2003
seven untitled haiku, *White Crane*, fall, 2000
“Passing” and “Taro,” short stories, *Whispering Campaign #4*, 1994

*Selected Articles & Reviews*
“Lost and Found: Samuel Delany’s The Motion of Light in Water,” Tin House, spring 2005
“Criminal Behavior: Depicting Gay/Straight Male Couples in Late 20th Century Film,” article, (translated into Polish by Agnieszka Sobolewska), Panoptikum #3, winter 2004
“Lost and Found: W.S. Merwin’s The Miner’s Pale Children,” article, Tin House, summer 2004
“Transgressions” (short stories by Sallie Bingham), review, Southern Humanities Review, 2004

Performances of Selected Plays & Monologues

“D/D,” word/dance performance at VCU Performing Arts Center, Richmond, VA 2000
“When the Cat Dies,” story performance at VCU Performing Arts Center, Richmond, VA 2000
“Slippery Slope,” monologue performed at Schaffer Street Playhouse, Richmond, VA, 1999
“Unfashionable,” monologue performed at Pink and Caffeine’s, Richmond, VA, 1998
“Tilden,” monologue performed at Alley Katz, Richmond, VA, 1998
Incubation, one act play, scenes performed by Firehouse Theatre Troupe at VCU Commons Theater, Richmond, VA, 1998
Broad Street: Black and White, play collectively written by VCU playwriting class (which I helped edit and directed), performed at VCU Commons Theater and Valentine Museum, Richmond, VA, 1998
“Rehearsing,” monologue performed at 1708 Gallery, Richmond, VA, 1997
Haiku Theater, play performed at Hole in the Wall and Twisters, Richmond, VA, 1996

Scholarships & Grants

Junior Faculty Grant, Richard Stockton College, 2006-07 academic year
Eastern Frontier Foundation Award, residency, Norton Island, ME, June-July 2006
Research and Development Grant, Richard Stockton College, summer 2006
Junior Faculty Grant, Richard Stockton College, 2005-06 academic year
Ucross Foundation Fellowship, residency, Ucross, WY, May-June 2005
Vermont Studio Center Writer’s Grant, residency, Johnson, VT, January 2004
Mellon Foundation Fellowship, Salzburg Seminar on Contemporary American Literature, spring 2003
Bread Loaf Writers’ Conference Full Scholarship, 2002 & 2003
Virginia Commission of the Arts Individual Artist’s Grant, 2001
Vermont Studio Center Writer’s Grant, residency, Johnson, VT, June 2001
Truman Capote Literary Trust Scholarship, Virginia Commonwealth University, 1998-99
VCU Graduate School Scholarship, Virginia Commonwealth University, spring 1997
MTSU Educational Grant, to study co-teaching, Middle Tennessee State University, spring 1995

Awards & Honors

Finalist, “Real Life Things,” Glimmer Train Short Short Story Contest, fall 2005
Selected short story for printed broadside, “Jealousy,” Fringe, distributed at AWP, 2006
Best American Spiritual Writing nominee, for “Between,” 2004
Best American Non-Required Reading nominee, for “Between,” 2004
Pushcart Prize Nominee, for “The Form of Things,” 2002
Third Place, Glimmer Train’s Short Short Story Contest, for “The Last Hot Day of Summer,” 2001
Winner, Triton College Poetry Contest, for “Moth,” 2000
Featured Writer-Playwright, for “Incubation,” one-act, Analecta XXV (U. of Texas at Austin journal), 1999
First Place, VCU representative: AWP Fiction Award (1999), & Scribner’s Fiction Contest (1998)
First Place, VCU English Department Graduate Fiction Award, 1998
Honorable Mention, Best of Gay Fiction 1996 (Little and Brown), ed. Brian Bouldrey, 1996
Honors Program Apprenticeship, U. of MD, researching playwright Sam Shepard, spring 1986
Honors English Literature Seminar, two-year Honors Literature Program, U. of MD, 1984-1986
Finalist (3 times), Glimmer Train’s Short Short Story Contest, 2000, 2004, 2005

Presentations

“Queer Fiction vs Queer Theory: A Personal Reading,” Queer Alliances Conference, Warsaw, Poland, August, 28-9, 2006
“Practice What We Teach,” chair, panel on pedagogy and art, Southern Humanities Conference, Feb., 2-5
“Brave New World of Gay Fiction,” panelist, James River Writers’ Festival, Richmond, VA, Sept., 29, 2005
“The Space Between ‘Boy’ and ‘Girl’: Facts and Fictions,” WILL/WGGS 25th Anniversary Speakers Series, University of Richmond, Richmond, VA, March, 2005
“Intersexuales and Queers: Dangerous Metaphors,” Europe Without Homophobia Conference, Wroclaw, Poland, June, 2004
“If Queer Theory Were My Lover; Queering Theory in the Academy,” Parameters of Desire Conference, Bialsko-Biala, Poland, June, 2003
“The Hermaphrodite in History and Theory,” “Contemporary American Literature:
Cultural Diversity and Aesthetic Continuities” (Salzburg Seminar), Salzburg, Austria, April, 2003


Editing & Feature Writing

**Invited board member, *inter alia*, international academic journal on queer studies, 2004**

**General Editor, The Literary Union, Virginia Union University literary journal, 1999-present**
- founded, produced, and edited student literary journal, with student staff

**Fiction/Non-Fiction Editor, RFD journal, 1994-2000**
- selected and edited prose for quarterly journal and ran RFD’s national fiction contest

**Assistant Fiction Editor, Two Girls Review, 1995-1996**

**Feature Writer, Staff, and Layout-Designer, RFD, 1990-1994**

**Feature Writer, Focus, Carnegie Mellon Faculty/Staff magazine, fall 1989**

Additional Teaching & Tutoring Experience

**Faculty, Governor’s School Humanities Program, University of Richmond, summer 2002, 2005**
- co-designed and co-taught two month-long interdisciplinary courses

**Guest Graduate Faculty, Virginia Commonwealth University, Spring 2005**
- course: “Themes in Interdisciplinary Studies: Book Review Writing”

**Guest Faculty, Virginia Commonwealth Society, 2003-2005**
- courses: “Life is Short: The Short Short Story” (I & II) “Writing to Publish”

**Tutor, Virginia Union University’s Academic Empowerment Center, 1997-2002**

**Instructor, Composition, Virginia Commonwealth University, 1996-97**

**Graduate Teaching Assistant, Shakespeare, Composition, Virginia Commonwealth U, 1997-98**

**Tutor, The Learning Center, private tutor service for learning disabled, Eugene, OR, 1995-96**

**Graduate Teaching Assistant, Reading Texts, Strategies for Writing, Carnegie Mellon U, 1988-90**

**Study Consultant, Johns Hopkins University Academic Skills Program, Baltimore, MD, 1986-87**

**Tutor, University of Maryland’s Writing Center, College Park, MD, 1985-86**
Community Work

**Board member/space member**, Richmond Queer Space Project, Richmond, VA, 2003-2005
- help develop and run a queer cultural community space; organized weekly free community workshop series; and brought in nationally recognized speakers discussing various social justice issues

**Fiction judge**, Virginia Commission of the Arts Individual Artist's Grant, 2003

**Coordinator/Mentor**, VCU New Artists/New Poets mentoring program, 1997-8
- mentored, organized student readings and mentoring, and produced a student literary journal

**Facilitator**, Richmond Organization for Sexual Minority Youth, 2001-2004
- facilitated group discussions, mentored youth, lead workshops, and facilitate focus groups
Kenneth Tompkins, Prof., Medieval and Renaissance British Literature

CURRICULUM VITAE

Kenneth D. Tompkins

Personal Information

Address: 171 Pitney Rd. Absecon, NJ 08201
Married

Education

B.A. University of Rochester, 1960
M.A. Indiana University, 1965
Ph.D. Indiana University, 1967

Professional Employment

1973 -- Present  Professor of Literature
Richard Stockton College of NJ

1970 - 1973  Chairman -- General Studies
Dean -- Experimental Studies
Richard Stockton College of NJ

1968 -- 1970  Chairman -- Department of English
Associate Professor of English
Central College -- Pella, Iowa

1965 -- 1968  Assistant Professor of English
Millikin University, Decatur, Illinois

Honors and Awards

2005  Scholar/Facilitator -- Literature & Medicine Project
Atlantic City Medical Center and New Jersey Council
For the Humanities

1991 & 1993  Distinguished Faculty Award -- Multimedia in the
Classroom

1983  NSF -- Chautauqua Short Course on Teaching
Science and the Humanities
1983  Lilly-Penn Conference on Computers and the Humanities: Textual Analysis, University of Pennsylvania

1981 -- 1982  Lilly-Penn Fellow: Graduate Computer Science Courses On Artificial Intelligence, University of Pennsylvania

1980 -- 1981  Lilly-Penn Fellow: Seminar on the Medieval Village University of Pennsylvania

Presented Paper on the Development of Stockton

1978  Graduation Speech -- Stockton State College

1978 -- 1990  Archaeological Dig at Wharram Percy, Yorks.
Chief Guide

Offices and Organizations: College

I have been on every major committee of the college either as chair or divisional representative; there are far too many to list here.

1997 -- 1999  Director of the M.A. Program in Instructional Technology
1994 -- 1996  Special Assistant to the VP for Technology and Instruction
1993 & 1994  Co-Chair, Select Committee -- Technology and Learning Strategies
1992  Co-Chair, Committee on Technology in the Classroom
Blue Ribbon Planning Task Force
1981 -- 1987  Director of the Microlabs
1985  Member, Blue Ribbon Task Force on Governor's Challenge Grant
1981 -- 1984  Chairman of the College Task Force on Computer Literacy
1980  Chairman, Curriculum Committee for the Middle States Self-study
1977 -- 1980  Member, Steering Committee of the Faculty Assembly
1978  Chairman, R&PD Committee
1974 -- 1975  Founder and First Co-Ordinator -- College Basic Studies Program (BASK)
Offices and Organizations: Community

Member:
- International Arthurian Society
- International Courtly Literature Society
- Medieval Academy of America
- Delaware Valley Medieval Association
- Board of Managers -- Atlantic City Friends School (1978)
- Board of Directors -- Institute for Community Justice (1985-7)
- Mediator -- Community Justice Program
- Divorce Mediator -- Community Justice Program
- International Association of Anglo-Saxonists

Publications:

Presentations:
Appendix VI: Preparing Graduate School Applications in English/Creative Writing

Handout

Preparing Graduate School Applications in English/Creative Writing

Richard Stockton LITT Program suggestions

Before you begin the hard work of applying for graduate school, take a moment to think about why you want to go to graduate school and whether it is the right choice for you. Are you a deeply committed, very hard working student? Are your grades generally excellent? Are you willing to postpone the chance to begin earning money now, for the possibility of a career in a highly competitive and not always so high paying environment? Are you willing to pursue a career where currently only 40% of Ph.D.s in English find a tenure-track job? Graduate school is very different from your undergraduate studies, so you might consider asking professors or other graduates whom you trust for their candid opinion how you would do in a graduate program (though don't take that as a final word: we all know people who've succeeded beyond anyone's expectations for them!). Once you've committed, consider these guidelines:

1. Set aside enough money to take the GREs and pay application fees and set aside enough time to take the test, send results, and fill out the applications. Begin drafting ideas for your application essays and prepare a sample of critical or creative writing.

2. Schedule and take the GREs. Apply for federal financial aid and look for appropriate scholarships in your community, associations, and state, as well as ones that might apply to your particular field of study and/or background (gender, race, income, region, etc.).

3. Decide on the kind of degree you want, the concentration you want to specialize in. Are you interested in an MA, MFA, or Ph.D. program? What kind of field within English most interests you (for example, Renaissance studies, modernism, gender and literature in Literature; or poetry, fiction, new media, etc.)? Have you thought about related degrees in English as a Second Language, Library Science, MA and Teaching certification combined programs, etc.?

4. Find three qualified professors who remember and like you to write evaluations and ask them if they will be willing. (It's ok to ask "Will you be willing to write me a good evaluation?" so that you are not surprised later by a bad one!). Contact them a month in advance, giving them at the very least 2 weeks to write the things--and check in on them to make sure they have remembered.

5. Research and select institutions:
   A. Make a list of 'must have' criteria for your graduate work and narrow the scope, then be as open as you can to programs. Consider the following: Faculty (check website to see how frequently key faculty members teach grad students), location, size of school, cost, fellowship opportunities, kind of degree, reputation of the school, flexibility of the program, opportunities to teach in the program, requirements (such as language requirements or other
tests), etc. Be certain of criteria: If you don’t want to live in TX, don't bother looking there--but be sure not to rule out interesting towns like, say, Austin.

**B.** You can look for specialties and rankings of universities at places such as *U.S. News and World Report*, *Peterson's Guides*, etc. (UCSB has a chart of rankings on line at http://www.english.ucsb.edu/undergrad/aftermajor/gradrankings.asp). You might then try to find recent graduates of the programs you are interested in—or, for your select few, email the coordinator and ask for email addresses of current students, so you can ask them questions directly.

**C.** Make a list of serious potentials (say, twice as many as you are willing to apply to) and request applications from institutions. Here’s a good time to point out that you should have a range of schools, in terms of selectivity—always have a couple “sure bets” in case you don’t get into schools you ideally want.

**D.** Read the materials carefully and select your winners. Visit the schools in advance if you can. You should probably pick between 3-10, depending on your needs/criteria and time/money constraints. Better to fill out five applications well than to do twenty poorly. Lastly, read all their application requirements carefully and make sure you have all the materials you need.

6. Write your application essay and share it with at least two other writers of experience—getting feedback from a professor is a good idea.

7. Prepare recommendation materials for your professors (give them the forms, SAS envelopes, and a clear list of the deadlines. You might offer a list of things you would like them to comment on and give them past work to refresh their memory of your skills. It’s also good to give them your application essay, so they know what you are emphasizing in your application.

8. Proofread your application materials! Ask for help. Make the deadlines!

9. Then go about your daily routine as though the letters you’re waiting on have no impact on your life. If you get in, tell us (especially those who recommended you--we want to know!). If you haven’t heard from where you really wanted, or didn’t get the funding you ideally wanted, wait as long as you can to see what your other options are, but be respectful of the universities’ deadlines for responding. If you get no funding, consider whether you want to take out the loans or apply again next year. If you don’t get in, don’t be discouraged! (Not all of us got into grad school on the first try.) Keep studying and learning. Then try again, and ask for more help.
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