

The 2012-13 Survey of
Humanities Departments at
Four-Year Institutions:
**English Language and
Literatures**

Susan White, Raymond Chu, and Roman Czujko
Statistical Research Center, American Institute of Physics

An excerpt from the full technical study conducted for the American Academy of Arts & Sciences.

Recommended Citation: Susan White, Raymond Chu, and Roman Czujko, *The 2012–13 Survey of Humanities Departments at Four-Year Institutions* (College Park, MD: Statistical Research Center, American Institute of Physics, 2014; sponsored by the American Academy of Arts & Sciences).

English

In this section, we will provide an overview of all HDS-1 English departments still awarding degrees at the time of HDS-2. We will start with the number of departments and faculty members. Next we will examine undergraduate and graduate education. We will then present data regarding tenure decisions, new hires, and faculty support for research. We also present information regarding online education and digital humanities.

Table EN1: HDS-1 Departments and Faculty Members by Carnegie Classification and Highest Degree Offered, Fall 2012

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No δ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Faculty Members	Total Number of Faculty Members*
Primarily Undergraduate	398 <i>See Appendix D.</i>	13.0 No δ	5,190
Comprehensive	440 <i>See Appendix D.</i>	26.8 No δ	11,770
Primarily Research	226 <i>See Appendix D.</i>	52.2 <i>Down 2.3 to 14.6</i>	11,790
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Faculty Members	Total Number of Faculty Members*
Bachelor’s	662 <i>See Appendix D.</i>	14.5 No δ	9,580
Master’s	250 <i>See Appendix D.</i>	43.3 No δ	10,830
Doctorate	152 <i>See Appendix D.</i>	54.9 <i>Down 0.4 to 16.9</i>	8,340
All Remaining HDS-1 Departments	1,064 <i>See Appendix D.</i>	27.0 <i>Down 0.4 to 6.4</i>	28,750

* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

There is a reduction in the average number of faculty members per department overall; the decrease appears to originate in the larger departments – those housed in primarily research institutions and those offering a doctorate.

Table EN2 presents faculty members by tenure status. While the proportion of full-time faculty members increased relative to the proportion of part-time faculty members (Table 3 in the Introduction), we see that the changes in the average number of faculty members has not changed significantly, except for a slight reduction in the number of tenure-track faculty members per department. The reduction in the number of tenure-track faculty members means the proportion of tenured faculty members increases. The small changes in the proportion of faculty members who are

The 2012-13 Survey of Humanities Departments

non-tenure-track full-time and part-time (Table 3 in the Introduction) is not reflected in the averages per department at the more granular level.

Table EN2: Faculty Members at HDS-1 Departments* by Tenure Status, Fall 2012

(The 95% confidence interval for the change from 2007 data is shown; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No δ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments			
	Tenured	Tenure-Track	Neither Tenured nor Tenure-Track, Full-Time	Neither Tenured nor Tenure-Track, Part-Time
Primarily Undergraduate	2,400 No δ	730 No δ	700 No δ	1,360 No δ
Comprehensive	4,370 No δ	1,170 No δ	1,340 No δ	4,890 No δ
Primarily Research	5,100 No δ	1,330 Down 0.4 to 3.1 per department	3,060 No δ	2,300 No δ
Highest Degree Offered	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments			
	Tenured	Tenure-Track	Neither Tenured nor Tenure-Track, Full-Time	Neither Tenured nor Tenure-Track, Part-Time
Bachelor’s	4,060 No δ	1,180 No δ	1,260 No δ	3,080 No δ
Master’s	3,970 No δ	1,110 Down 0.3 to 2.4 per department	1,710 No δ	4,040 No δ
Doctorate	3,840 No δ	940 No δ	2,130 No δ	1,430 No δ
TOTAL	11,870 No δ	3,230 Down 0.3 to 1.4 per department	5,100 No δ	8,550 No δ

* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not included any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

Table EN3 presents faculty members by employment status and gender. As with the tenure status, there are a few significant per-department changes in the average number of part-time faculty members and in the average number of men among the faculty members in some departments. These slight changes did not result in a significant change in the proportions shown in Table 3 (in the Introduction).

Table EN3: Faculty Members at HDS-1 Departments* by Employment Status and Gender, Fall 2012

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No δ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments			
	Full-Time*	Part-Time*	Men*	Women*
Primarily Undergraduate	3,790 No δ	1,400 No δ	2,270 No δ	2,920 No δ
Comprehensive	6,735 No δ	5,035 No δ	5,400 No δ	6,370 No δ
Primarily Research	9,385 No δ	2,405 <i>Down 0.2 to 10.8 per department</i>	5,405 <i>Down 2.2 to 8.5 per department</i>	6,385 No δ
Highest Degree Offered	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments			
	Full-Time*	Part-Time*	Men*	Women*
Bachelor’s	6,400 No δ	3,180 <i>Down 0.1 to 2.2 per department</i>	4,285 No δ	5,295 No δ
Master’s	6,680 No δ	4,150 No δ	4,940 No δ	5,890 No δ
Doctorate	6,830 No δ	1,510 No δ	3,850 <i>Down 1.5 to 9.9 per department</i>	4,490 No δ
TOTAL	19,910 No δ	8,840 No δ	13,075 <i>Down 0.4 to 3.5 per department</i>	15,675 No δ

* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

Not every department housed in an institution classified as primarily research using the Carnegie classifications offers a doctorate, or even a master’s. Table EN4 details the highest degree offered by English departments housed at various institutions. At eleven “Primarily Undergraduate” institutions, the English department offers a master’s. All of the doctoral-granting departments are housed in primarily research institutions.

Table EN4: Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments* by Carnegie Classification and Highest Degree Offered, Fall 2012

(The 95% confidence interval for the change from 2007 data is shown; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. "No δ " indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

		Highest Degree Offered			All Remaining HDS-1 Departments
		Bachelor's	Master's	Doctorate	
Carnegie Classification	Primarily Undergraduate	387	11	0	398
	Comprehensive	266	174	0	440
	Primarily Research	9	65	152	226
All Remaining HDS-1 Departments		662	250	152	1,064

*These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

Table EN5 summarizes responses to the question of how many bachelor's degrees were awarded in English during the 2011-12 academic year. Departments at "Primarily Research" institutions accounted for almost half of the bachelor's degrees awarded. While the overall average exhibits a statistically significant decline, it should be noted that the confidence interval is quite large, indicating a higher level of uncertainty. The decline is not statistically significant at the more granular levels in the table.

Table EN5: Bachelor’s Degrees completed in English in HDS-1 Departments in the 2011-12 Academic Year

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No δ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded	Total Number of Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded*
Primarily Undergraduate	398	22.6 <i>No δ</i>	8,990
Comprehensive	440	34.1 <i>No δ</i>	15,010
Primarily Research	226	96.4 <i>No δ</i>	21,780
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded	Total Number of Bachelor’s Degrees Awarded*
Bachelor’s	662	24.7 <i>No δ</i>	16,380
Master’s	250	50.0 <i>No δ</i>	12,510
Doctorate	152	111.1 <i>No δ</i>	16,890
All Remaining HDS-1 Departments	43.0 <i>Down 0.9 to 36.1</i>	1,064	45,780

* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

Table EN6 presents data on the number of juniors and seniors with a declared major in English. There is a significant decrease in the per-department number of juniors and seniors with a declared major in English in the smaller departments (those housed in primarily undergraduate institutions and those offering only a bachelor’s degree). However, there is no statistically significant change overall.

If the number of students receiving bachelor’s degrees is to remain fairly constant, then one would expect the number of juniors and seniors with a declared major to be at least twice as large as the number of bachelor’s degree recipients. That was true in the first round of this study, and it continues to be case in English this round.

Table EN6: Number of Juniors and Seniors with Declared Major in English in HDS-1 Departments as of the Beginning of the Fall 2012 Term

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No δ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Juniors & Seniors with Declared Major	Total Number of Juniors & Seniors with Declared Major*
Primarily Undergraduate	398	35.3 <i>Down 2.8 to 19.8</i>	14,040
Comprehensive	440	50.8 No δ	22,360
Primarily Research	226	245.0 No δ	55,360
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Juniors & Seniors with Declared Major	Total Number of Juniors & Seniors with Declared Major*
Bachelor’s	662	38.2 <i>Down 5.5 to 21.0</i>	25,275
Master’s	250	104.9 No δ	26,225
Doctorate	152	264.9 No δ	40,260
All Remaining HDS-1 Departments	1,064	86.2 No δ	91,760

* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

There were no statistically significant changes in the average number of students in each department completing a minor in English. These data are detailed in Table EN7. During the 2011 – 2012 academic year, English departments awarded, on average, about 43 bachelor’s degrees per department and had about 14 students per department earn a minor in the field.

Table EN7: Number of Students Completing a Minor in English during the 2011-12 Academic Year

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No δ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Students Completing a Minor	Total Number of Students Completing a Minor*
Primarily Undergraduate	398	9.6 <i>No δ</i>	3,840
Comprehensive	440	12.1 <i>No δ</i>	5,310
Primarily Research	226	26.1 <i>No δ</i>	5,890
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Students Completing a Minor	Total Number of Students Completing a Minor*
Bachelor’s	662	10.2 <i>No δ</i>	6,755
Master’s	250	18.1 <i>No δ</i>	4,535
Doctorate	152	24.7 <i>No δ</i>	3,750
All Remaining HDS-1 Departments	1,064	14.1 <i>No δ</i>	15,040

* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

As shown in Table EN8, there were almost 22,000 graduate students enrolled in programs in English departments during the Fall 2012 term. About two-thirds of these students were in departments that awarded a doctorate.

Table EN8: Number of Graduate Students in English during Fall 2012 Term

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No δ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

Carnegie Classification	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Graduate Students (per department that offers graduate degree)	Total Number of Graduate Students*
Primarily Undergraduate	398	0 <i>No δ</i>	0
Comprehensive	440	21.5 <i>No δ</i>	3,735
Primarily Research	226	83.3 <i>No δ</i>	18,075
Highest Degree Offered	Number of Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Among Remaining HDS-1 Departments	
		Average Number of Graduate Students	Total Number of Graduate Students*
Bachelor’s	662	0 <i>No δ</i>	0
Master’s	250	28.7 <i>No δ</i>	7,170
Doctorate	152	96.3 <i>No δ</i>	14,640
All Remaining HDS-1 Departments	1,064	54.3 <i>No δ</i>	21,810

* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

Overall, about three-fourths of the students enrolled in undergraduate introductory English courses are taught by a full-time faculty member, and 5% are taught by graduate students. These data are presented in Table EN9. The differences indicated by the asterisk (*) in the table means that the proportion of students taught by that rank faculty member in that type of department differs significantly from the other comparable types of department (either by Carnegie Classification, by highest degree offered, or by form of control). A student in a department housed in a Primarily Undergraduate institution (by Carnegie Classification) is more likely to be taught by a full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty member than students in departments housed in Comprehensive or Primarily Research institutions. The same is also true for a student in a department housed in a private institution.

It must again be noted that statistical significance depends on a number of factors, not solely the absolute difference between two values. While differences that are not marked as significant may seem to be the same size as, or even larger than, those marked as significant, they are not statistically significant. The most likely factors attributing to the lack of significance when the absolute difference seems “large enough” are a smaller sample size or a larger variation within that discipline.

Table EN9: Instructor of Record for Undergraduate Introductory Courses in English in HDS-1 Departments, Fall 2012 Term

	% of students taught by ...			
	Full-Time Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Part-Time Faculty Members	Graduate Students in the Department
By Carnegie Classification				
Primarily Undergraduate	62%*	19%	18%	2%*
Comprehensive	51%	17%*	30%*	3%*
Primarily Research	49%	21%	16%	15%
By Highest Degree Offered				
Bachelor's	57%	19%	23%*	1%*
Master's	49%	23%*	21%*	8%*
Doctorate	54%	15%	9%	21%
By Form of Control				
Public	52%	20%	17%	11%
Private	57%*	18%	21%*	3%*
All Institutions	56%	19%	20%	5%

* indicates that the proportion is significantly different from primarily research (for Carnegie Classification) or from Doctorate (for Highest Degree Offered) or from Public (for Form of Control) at the 5% level.

We used regression analysis for these tests with a binary (0-1) variable for the level of interest. If the coefficient for the binary variable differed significantly from 0, then the interpretation from regression is that the discipline differs from all other levels combined.

Statistical significance depends on a number of factors, not solely the absolute difference between two values. While differences that are not marked as significant may seem to be the same size as, or even larger than, those marked as significant, they are not statistically significant. The most likely factors attributing to the lack of significance when the absolute difference seems “large enough” are a smaller sample size or a larger variation within that discipline.

Table EN10 presents results for the instructor of record for all other (non-introductory) classes in English. Students in departments housed in primarily undergraduate institutions are more likely to be taught by full-time faculty members than students in departments housed in comprehensive or primarily research institutions. There is no statistically significant difference by form of control.

Finally, Table EN11 summarizes the results for the instructor of record in graduate courses. Students are less likely to be taught by full-time faculty members in departments which offer a doctorate.

Table EN10: Instructor of Record for All Other Undergraduate (Non-Introductory) Courses in English in HDS-1 Departments, Fall 2012 Term

	% of students taught by ...			
	Full-Time Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Part-Time Faculty Members	Graduate Students in the Department
By Carnegie Classification				
Primarily Undergraduate	79%*	16%	4%	0%*
Comprehensive	73%	16%	11%*	0%*
Primarily Research	69%	19%	7%	5%
By Highest Degree Offered				
Bachelor's	76%	17%	7%*	0%*
Master's	71%	19%	10%*	0%*
Doctorate	72%	16%	4%	9%
By Form of Control				
Public	73%	17%	6%	3%
Private	75%	17%	7%	0%*
All Institutions	75%	17%	7%*	1%

* indicates that the proportion is significantly different from primarily research (for Carnegie Classification) or from Doctorate (for Highest Degree Offered) or from Public (for Form of Control) at the 5% level.

* indicates that the proportion is significantly different from all other disciplines combined at the 5% level

We used regression analysis for these tests with a binary (0-1) variable for the level of interest. If the coefficient for the binary variable differed significantly from 0, then the interpretation from regression is that the discipline differs from all other levels combined.

Statistical significance depends on a number of factors, not solely the absolute difference between two values.

While differences that are not marked as significant may seem to be the same size as, or even larger than, those marked as significant, they are not statistically significant. The most likely factors attributing to the lack of significance when the absolute difference seems "large enough" are a smaller sample size or a larger variation within that discipline.

Table EN11: Instructor of Record for All Graduate Courses in English in HDS-1 Departments, Fall 2012 Term

	% of students taught by ...			
	Full-Time Tenured or Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Full-Time Non-Tenure-Track Faculty Members	Part-Time Faculty Members	Graduate Students in the Department
By Carnegie Classification				
Primarily Undergraduate	93%	5%	2%	0%
Comprehensive	97%	2%	1%	0%
Primarily Research	96%	3%	0%	1%
By Highest Degree Offered				
Bachelor's	93%	7%*	0%	0%
Master's	94%	6%*	0%	0%
Doctorate	97%	1%	1%	1%
By Form of Control				
Public	97%	2%	0%	1%
Private	91%*	6%	3%*	1%
All Institutions	96%*	3%	1%	1%

* indicates that the proportion is significantly different from primarily research (for Carnegie Classification) or from Doctorate (for Highest Degree Offered) or from Public (for Form of Control) at the 5% level.

* indicates that the proportion is significantly different from all other disciplines combined at the 5% level.

We used regression analysis for these tests with a binary (0-1) variable for the level of interest. If the coefficient for the binary variable differed significantly from 0, then the interpretation from regression is that the discipline differs from all other levels combined.

Statistical significance depends on a number of factors, not solely the absolute difference between two values.

While differences that are not marked as significant may seem to be the same size as, or even larger than, those marked as significant, they are not statistically significant. The most likely factors attributing to the lack of significance when the absolute difference seems "large enough" are a smaller sample size or a larger variation within that discipline.

Table EN12 presents the results for the assessment of undergraduate student learning in English departments. Learning outcomes assessment is an aggregate assessment which attempts to measure the effectiveness of a program or institution by examining the competence of a given cohort of students. We did not ask about the assessment of individual students; we asked respondents to tell us whether or not they assessed undergraduate student learning. Overall, 90% of the departments perform some type of aggregate assessment of undergraduate student learning.

Table EN12: Assessment of Overall Undergraduate Student Learning in English in HDS-1 Departments as of the Fall 2012 Term

	All Institutions	Carnegie Classification			Form of Control	
		Primarily Undergraduate	Comprehensive	Primarily Research	Public	Private
No Departmental Assessment	10%	8%	5%	21%	12%	8%
Departmental Assessment for All Majors	85%	85%	90%	71%	84%	85%
Departmental Assessment for Majors in Honors Program Only	1%	0%	0%	2%	0%	1%
Departmental Assessment for Some Other Group of Students	18%	23%	12%	19%	14%	20%

Note: The sum of the four rows in any column may exceed 100% because respondents could select multiple choices.

The “assessment” referenced is an aggregate assessment based on examining the results from a given cohort of students in an attempt to examine the effectiveness of a program.

For English, 63% of the department view publications as either essential or very important in tenure decisions; 73% of all of the departments in the study view publications this way. Publications appear to be more important at primarily research institutions. The importance of teaching and service are about the same in English departments as they are in all other disciplines combined. The views of English departments on the importance of public humanities are also similar to that for all disciplines combined. Details for English departments are shown in Table EN13.

Table EN13: Considerations in Tenure Decisions in English in HDS-1 Departments, Fall 2012

	CC*	Essential	Very Important	Important	Marginally Important	Unimportant
Publications (research, scholarship, and creative work)	All	46%	17%	25%	10%	2%
	PUG	29%	19%	29%	19%	4%
	Comp	35%	22%	35%	7%	2%
	PRes	96%	4%	0%	0%	0%
Teaching	All	81%	13%	4%	1%	1%
	PUG	85%	8%	4%	0%	2%
	Comp	89%	9%	0%	2%	0%
	PRes	55%	30%	13%	2%	0%
Service to the department or institution	All	25%	42%	25%	7%	1%
	PUG	25%	48%	25%	0%	2%
	Comp	29%	42%	22%	7%	0%
	PRes	17%	30%	32%	19%	2%
Public humanities (making the humanities and/or humanities scholarship accessible to the general public)	All	0%	5%	29%	46%	19%
	PUG	0%	2%	35%	42%	21%
	Comp	0%	4%	28%	48%	20%
	PRes	0%	13%	21%	49%	17%

*CC – Carnegie classification and PUG – Primarily Undergraduate, Comp – Comprehensive, & PRes – Primarily Research

Table EN14: Faculty Tenure Decisions and New Hires in HDS-1 Departments

(The 95% confidence interval for the **change in average per department** from 2007 data is provided in italics; the width of the interval indicates the uncertainty in the estimate. “No δ ” indicates any change exhibited is not statistically significant.)

	Number in Remaining HDS-1 Departments*	Relative to ...
Tenured Faculty Members as of Fall 2012 (Fall 2007)	11,870	41% of total faculty members <i>Up 2% to 4%</i>
Tenure-Track Faculty Members (not yet tenured) as of Fall 2012 (Fall 2007)	3,230	11% of total faculty members <i>Down 1% to 2%</i>
Tenure-Track Faculty Members Granted Tenure per Year (Two-Year Average) 2010-11 & 2011-12 (2005-06 & 2006-07)	245 per year	8% of tenure-track, not yet tenured faculty members No δ
Faculty Members Denied Tenure or Leaving Prior to Tenure Decision per Year (Two-Year Average) 2010-11 & 2011-12 (2005-06 & 2006-07)	15 per year	<1% of tenure-track, not yet tenured faculty members No δ
Tenured, Tenure-Track and Permanent Faculty Members Hired for 2012-13 (2007-08)	900	5% of full-time faculty members No δ

* These should not be compared directly with 2007 data since these data do not include any departments that have been created in the interim. These data can be interpreted as estimates of minima for all 2012-13 departments combined.

As seen in Table EN14, there are no significant changes in the faculty tenure decisions and new hires in English departments.

Almost all English departments (or the institutions in which they are housed) provide support for research for full-time tenured or tenure-track faculty members; this is comparable to all disciplines combined. Support for non-tenured or non-tenure-track and part-time faculty members in English departments is also comparable to all disciplines combined. The data are presented in Table EN15.

Table EN15: Availability of Institutional or Departmental Support for Research in HDS-1 Departments, Fall 2012

	% of Institutions or Departments Providing Support
For Full-time tenure or tenure-track faculty members	93%
For full-time non-tenured or non-tenure-track faculty members	70%
For part-time faculty members	27%

When looking at all disciplines, about one department in three (33%) offers a fully online course, and about one in five (19%) offers a hybrid course. English departments appear to be slightly more likely to offer either type of course. At the departments where these courses are offered, it appears that there

The 2012-13 Survey of Humanities Departments

are a comparable number of fully online or hybrid courses offered as for all the disciplines combined. The details are shown in Table AH16.

Table EN16: HDS-1 English Departments Offering Online Courses by Carnegie Classification and Form of Control, 2011-12 Academic Year

	Departments Offering Fully Online Courses	Average Number of Fully Online Courses Offered	Departments Offering Hybrid Courses	Average Number of Hybrid Courses Offered
By Carnegie Classification				
Primarily Undergraduate	30%	3.3	21%	8.6
Comprehensive	50%	6.4	29%	4.9
Primarily Research	52%	7.9	21%	2.7
By Form of Control				
Public	62%	7.4	33%	7.2
Private	31%	4.1	18%	3.9
All Institutions	43%	5.4	24%	5.2

While they appear to be comparable to all institution combine with respect to online courses, English departments overall appear to be more likely than all disciplines combined to offer seminars focusing on digital methods for research and teaching and to have formal guidelines for evaluating digital publications for tenure and promotion. These results are summarized in Table EN17.

Table EN17: Engagement with Digital Humanities by Carnegie Classification and Form of Control in HDS-1 Departments as of Fall 2012

	Offered Seminar Focusing on Digital Methods for Research and Teaching	Have Formal Guidelines for Evaluating Digital Publications for Tenure and Promotion
By Carnegie Classification		
Primarily Undergraduate	18%	18%
Comprehensive	26%	19%
Primarily Research	28%	23%
By Form of Control		
Public	26%	29%
Private	23%	13%
All Institutions	24%	20%