

Proposed College of Arts and Sciences Writing Studies Program

1. OVERVIEW

This is a proposal to restructure the English Composition Program as a Writing Studies Program in the College of Arts and Sciences in order to bring the University of Miami in line with national standards and best practices in the postsecondary teaching of writing across the curriculum.^{1, 2}

Indeed, writing is embedded in all disciplines and social practices—in the sciences, humanities, arts, social sciences, medicine, technology, education and more—and shapes and informs how writers reach their audience within and outside the academy. It should therefore be distinct from other disciplinary units.

This new program will parallel structures at peer and aspirational peer institutions (Appendix A). It will, moreover, follow the primary recommendation in the December 2018 external review from the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA) regarding the appropriate placement of our writing program within the university: *establish a writing studies program outside of the English Department and develop it as an independent unit* (Appendix B).

The new Writing Studies Program, including Writing Centers at each of the three university campuses, will be administered by the Office of Interdisciplinary and Professional Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences, reporting to the Dean. Faculty appointments, as per the faculty manual, will continue to be in appropriate departments.

Specifically, the new Writing Studies Program will

- continue to provide robust, multi-disciplinary and university-wide writing instruction and support at all levels, from first-year “written communication skills” as a key component of general education proficiency, to mid- and upper-level writing in and across the disciplines. ENG courses taught by composition faculty will transfer to and be taught in the Writing Studies Program under a new WRT designation. Examples might include:
 - 101 Writing Lab
 - 103 Basic Academic Writing
 - 105 Composition I
 - 106 Composition II
 - 107 Composition II Science and Technology (for College of Engineering, STEM, Health Sciences)
 - 208 Advanced Academic Writing for Transfer Students
 - 230 Advanced Professional Communication
 - 231 Advanced Writing for Arts & Humanities
 - 232 Advanced Writing for People & Society
 - 233 Advanced Writing for STEM
 - 300 Advanced Scientific Writing
 - 301 The Study of Language
 - 306 Advanced Composition
 - 331 Legal Writing
 - 332 Writing for Civic Engagement
 - 333 Writing the Research Paper
 - 334 Legal Rhetoric
- offer an undergraduate minor in Professional and Technical Writing and Communication.
- foster university-wide, inter- and cross-disciplinary collaboration.

¹ “Principles for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing.” Conference on College Composition and Communication (CCCC), October 1989, Revised November 2013, Revised March 2015.

<https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/postsecondarywriting>

² The AAC&U recognizes the importance of written communication as an “intellectual and practical skill.” The tool they have elaborated to assess it (one of their core VALUE rubrics) is already used at UM to evaluate other interdisciplinary undergraduate courses of study such as the Independent Major and the Bachelor of General Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences.

- continue to support and develop effective writing practices in the disciplines through its well-established Summer Writing Institute and other outreach efforts; these include the Writing Centers on all three campuses.
- maintain and expand graduate student and faculty research, publication, and grant writing support for all departments, schools, and colleges. This includes science- and grant-writing workshops, the dissertation writing group, the faculty writing group, and writing boot camps.
- offer professional development and increased employment opportunities for graduate students in multiple disciplines. This would increase the content and knowledge base of the Writing Studies Program, as well as offer key professional development and experience for graduate students in all disciplines.
- continue to contribute to student retention and persistence in general. Success in the first-year writing class is a key measure of overall student success and retention rates.³

A Writing Studies Program housed centrally in the College of Arts and Sciences would therefore (i) meet national standards and best practices in teaching effective writing skills across the curriculum, (ii) best serve the multiple and varied needs of a diverse student and faculty population, (iii) create more literate and professionally prepared graduating students, (iv) provide employment and career development for graduate students across the disciplines, (v) improve the university's competitiveness and ability to obtain external funding, and (vi) increase UM's presence in the peer-reviewed literature by expanding academic publication support.

2. GOVERNANCE AND STRUCTURE

The new Writing Studies Program will have a director and assistant/associate directors as appropriate (current configuration), and it will comprise current English Composition faculty, graduate students, and staff members.

An advisory board, chaired by the Writing Studies Program director, will consist of at least six faculty representatives from a variety of disciplines; they will be appointed based on recommendations from current writing program faculty. Ideally, each school or college will provide at least one faculty representative.

A rotating committee will be appointed from the Writing Studies Program faculty to advise on curriculum and other program matters.

The program director will be appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The recommendations of the Writing Studies Program faculty will be taken into account in making this appointment. Appointment will ordinarily be for a three-year term, and will be renewable.

³ First-year writing/composition (FYC) is "the class most closely tied to impacting retention. Whether for reasons of motivation, language skills, first-generation status, work-life balance, or inadequate preparation, students struggling in FYC also struggle in their major. The FYC course, then, should have a privileged position in terms of paying attention to student success and retention." Nathan Garrett, Matthew Bridgewater, and Bruce Feinstein, "How Student Performance in First-Year Composition Predicts Retention and Overall Student Success". *Retention, Persistence, and Writing Programs*, edited by Todd Ruecker et al., Utah State University Press, 2017, pp. 95-96. Writing faculty have been closely monitoring and reporting on student engagement for many years, and constitute the only UM entity that reports regularly on this data.

The Writing Studies Program will have control over its curriculum (subject to the usual Faculty Manual and advisory board procedure), follow best practices in writing studies pedagogy, and be self-governing in accordance with the Faculty Manual, for instance, to appoint advisory boards.

Relevant departments will be encouraged to honor program recommendations for faculty hiring.

Annual faculty evaluations for those faculty whose effort is 100% in the program will be conducted, as has been the practice for two decades, by the program director. Recommendations for promotion will be made by the program director to the appropriate department chair, who will, per custom, follow that recommendation. The Dean will make final decisions.

Relevant department chairs will generally follow any other personnel or faculty recommendations made by the program director in relation to Writing Studies Program faculty whose effort is 100% in the program.

The Writing Studies Program will consist of the current full-time English Composition faculty and English graduate student teaching assistants. Structure, status, and required minimum qualifications of these existing faculty will not change. The pedagogical development of graduate students will remain an important feature of the program. Additional faculty and graduate TAs would be hired in case of increased need, or because of attrition (existing employment regulations notwithstanding). Current staff administrative positions for the day-to-day operations will be maintained.

2.1 Possible sub-divisions/programs

- First-Year Writing

- Professional and Technical Writing (business, civic, legal, advanced writing, STEM)

- Writing in the Disciplines

- Writing Centers/Learning Commons

2.2 Space

Current adequate facilities exist at Ferre and Richter Learning Commons

3. SOURCES OF FUNDING

Existing funding and faculty lines would be reapportioned. This proposal entails no additional costs. The English Composition Program budget would become the Writing Studies Program budget.

4. SUMMARY

The CWPA external review recommends unequivocally that the University of Miami should structure its writing program as an independent unit, where “separation from English is vital, if the writing program is to reach its potential on behalf of Miami students.” Moreover, writing program faculty “can become a shining light for the University, potentially a nationally recognized writing program, if sufficiently supported.”

Establishing a Writing Studies Program that is housed centrally in the College of Arts and Sciences would signal to undergraduate and graduate students across the university, to every school and college in the university community, to all faculty and researchers, and to the wider community, that we are firmly committed to the development and importance of writing as crucial to the intellectual mission of the entire university and to the success of students and graduates in the academic and professional world.

Appendix A

Key	College- or university-wide	English/other department with faculty representation	English without representation	Unable to determine
-----	-----------------------------	--	--------------------------------	---------------------

1. AAU Institutions

	Unit name/description	Configuration
Boston University	CAS Writing Program	Housed in Arts and Sciences. 100+ faculty professors, lecturers and TAs in a variety of disciplines
Brandeis	University Writing Program	Director is Associate Professor in Department of Romance Studies
Brown	Nonfiction writing program	Lecturer faculty in the Department of English
Caltech	None: one scientific writing course EN/WR 84; Hixon writing Center	Writing center director (lecturer) supports discipline faculty to incorporate writing in their courses
Carnegie Mellon	First Year Writing Program; Rhetoric, Professional, and Technical Writing	Several tenured lines in rhetoric etc. within English department
Case Western	Writing Program in CAS	Director is Assoc. Prof in English; faculty also housed in CAS
Columbia	Undergraduate Writing Program: University Writing core curriculum	Directors of program are lecturers; graduate students from all A&S disciplines teach
Cornell	Knight Institute for Writing in the Disciplines	Independent; director is professor in English
Duke University	Thompson Writing Program	Director is assoc prof in Classical studies; program faculty comprises professors of practice and lecturers
Emory	Writing Curriculum and Initiatives; Writing program housed in CAS	Director is senior lecturer in English
Georgia Tech	Writing and Communication program housed in School of Literature, Media and Communication	Director is professor in the School of Literature, Media and Communication
Harvard	Harvard College Writing Program	Sosland Director is professor in Faculty of Arts & Sciences
Indiana University-Bloomington	Campus Writing Program (Center for Innovative Teaching and Learning)	Director is assoc prof in English
Iowa State University	First-Year Writing, housed in English.	PhD offered in Rhetoric & Composition (RC), several tenured faculty lines
Johns Hopkins	Expository Writing program. Independent in College of A&S	Faculty are teaching professors and lecturers in the college

Massachusetts Institute of Technology	Writing is housed in Comparative Media Studies	Professors are multidisciplinary in comparative media studies
McGill University	Academic unit is the "Writing Centre"	Writing courses housed in the multidisciplinary "writing centre" academic unit. Faculty at various ranks including TT
Michigan State University	Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and American cultures	Comprehensive department with UG and PG specialties, rhet/comp, multidisciplinary, all ranks of faculty
New York University	Expository Writing program in CAS	Director is assoc prof in English. Faculty are lecturers
Northwestern	Cook Family Writing Program	Independent; Director is Professor in Department of Linguistics; faculty from a variety of fields and ranks.
Ohio State	First year writing program	Several tenured faculty in RC in dept of English
Pennsylvania State	Program in Writing and Rhetoric	Director is Distinguished Professor of English and Women's Studies; Offers minors in different departments (various courses similar to cognates)
Princeton	Princeton Writing Program	Housed in Office of the Dean of the College; offers first-year writing and writing in the disciplines
Purdue University	Professional Writing minor program MA PhD Rhetoric and Composition	Tenured professors in English
Rice	Program in Writing and Communication	Leadership and faculty from a variety of disciplines; advisory board in the disciplines;
Rutgers	Writing Program in A&S	FT, PT, and TAs from disciplines across A&S
Stanford	Independent Program in Writing and Rhetoric	All ranks of faculty
Stony Brook	Program in writing and Rhetoric in CAS	All ranks of faculty in program
Texas A&M	Writing program in English	Several tenured lines in English. Writing program director is asst provost for undergraduate education
Tulane	In English department	Professors of practice/lecturers
University of Arizona	Writing program in department of English	Multiple tenured lines in rhet/comp
University of Buffalo	Writing program in department of English	Director is tenured professor in department
UC Davis	University Writing Program	Director is Professor of Rhetoric; faculty of various ranks
UC Berkeley	College Writing Programs	Cross/multidisciplinary

UC Irvine	Composition Program	Director is Assoc. Prof. in English
UCLA	Writing Programs -- teaching and learning center	Lecturer faculty
UC San Diego	independent writing programs housed in each of the six colleges	Lecturer faculty
UC Santa Barbara	The Writing Program housed in College of Letters & Science	Director is Co-Interim Dean of Undergraduate Education and Professor of Writing Studies; writing faculty at all ranks; includes graduate student instructors from various disciplines
University of Chicago	The writing program, a support unit offering training and pedagogy and writing in the disciplines	Lecturer and graduate faculty
University of Colorado-Boulder	The Program for Writing and Rhetoric	Independent Program in A&S; Director is Assoc Prof in English; Assoc. Dir. is Prof in Comm (College of Media, Communication and Information)
University of Florida	University writing program	Lecturer faculty
University of Illinois—Urbana-Champaign	Department/Center for Writing Studies	Interdisciplinary; committees with representation from various disciplines and various ranks of faculty and graduate students; director is Prof. of English
University of Iowa	Department of Rhetoric	GER in Rhetoric; Minor in Rhetoric and Persuasion; various ranks
University of Kansas	KU core courses in communication	Courses are preexisting, given communication designation by “core” unit
University of Maryland	Academic/Professional Writing Program	Director of program is Professor in English
University of Michigan	Gayle Morris Sweetland Center for Writing	Director is professor in English; executive committee across different schools; faculty various ranks
University of Minnesota	Department of Writing Studies	In College of Liberal Arts -- multi disciplinary. 12 tenured professors, WEC program, as well as affiliate faculty
University of Missouri-Columbia	Campus Writing Program (CWP)	FYW = 1 course in English; 2 WI courses in the disciplines; CWP supervisory role for WID courses (Campus writing board)
UNC Chapel Hill	Writing Program	Director of Writing Program is Associate Chair in English
University of Oregon	Composition Program	In English Department; Director is a Senior Lecturer; (Department also has a Center for Teaching Writing--professional training for faculty)
University of Pennsylvania	Critical Writing Program	Center for Programs in Writing (university-wide)

University of Pittsburgh	Writing Program in English Department.	Professors/tenured faculty in English department
University of Rochester	Writing, Speaking, and Argument Program	Independent in Arts, Science, and Engineering; Director is Assoc. Prof. not in English
University of Southern California	Writing Program housed in the College of Letters, Arts, and Sciences	Lecturers and Associate teaching professors of Writing in the College
University of Texas at Austin	Department of Rhetoric and Writing	Professor/chair; various ranks and disciplines for faculty
University of Toronto	First year writing in English	Unable to determine configuration
University of Virginia	Academic and Professional Writing Program	TT lines in English. Director is assoc professor in English
University of Washington	Expository Writing Program	Several RC faculty in dept of English. (Prof/Assoc. Chair in charge of Writing Programs)
University of Wisconsin-Madison	Composition and Rhetoric Program; FYW Program and WAC Program for Faculty support	All housed in English. Comp/Rhet program is multidisciplinary; various ranks
Vanderbilt	Writing Studio assists faculty teaching university writing seminars	Freshman writing seminar
Washington Univ. St. Louis	College Writing Program	Director (not in English); Upper-level courses
Yale	Writing courses offered through Center for Teaching and Learning	Faculty in the disciplines offer writing courses with pedagogic support from Center for TAL

2. Other Top 50 Colleges/Universities (US News and World Report)

Boston College	Freshman Writing Seminar classes in English department	Director is associate professor of English
College of William and Mary	Writing courses are College Writing COLL 100 and 150	Courses are cross-listed with other disciplines
Dartmouth College	Institute for Writing and Rhetoric	Director of Institute is associate professor of Linguistics
Florida State University	College Composition Program; MA and PhD graduate programs in writing and rhetoric	Tenured faculty housed in English, Communication and other departments
Georgetown	Writing Program	In English; tenured faculty
Lehigh	First Year Writing in English	Director is associate in English

Northeastern	Writing Program housed in English	Directors are associate teaching professors in English
Pepperdine	Composition; English major has emphasis in writing and rhetoric	Visiting assistant professors; Composition Director is tenured in English
Rensselaer Poly	Writing intensive requirement - various disciplines	Faculty in all disciplines, all ranks
Tufts	First Year Writing in English	Director is associate professor in English
University of Notre Dame	University Writing Program	Independent in CAS; director is professor in English
Villanova	Program in Writing and Rhetoric	"Multi department"; program is in English; director is tenured in English
Wake Forest	The Writing Program; Interdisciplinary writing minor	Tenured faculty housed in English

3. Florida Universities*

Florida International University	Writing and Rhetoric Program	Director is Professor in English
Florida State University*	College Composition Program; MA and PhD graduate programs in writing and rhetoric	Tenured faculty housed in English, Communication and other departments
University of Central Florida	Department of Writing and Rhetoric	Tenured faculty
University of Florida*	University Writing Program	Lecturer faculty
University of Miami	English Composition Program	Lecturer faculty in Department of English
University of South Florida	First year writing; Professional writing, rhetoric and technology major and minor	Tenured faculty in English

* Carnegie Classification R1: Doctoral Universities. University of Florida and Florida State University data included again here for comparison (see also tables 1 and 2)

Appendix B

National Council of Writing Program Administrators' External Review of the English Composition Program at the University of Miami, December 2018

FINAL REPORT

**EXTERNAL REVIEW OF
THE ENGLISH DEPARTMENT COMPOSITION PROGRAM
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI**

Submitted on behalf of the
National Council of Writing Program Administrators

by

Dr. Barbara Cambridge
Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis

Dr. Christopher Thaiss
University of California, Davis

December 3, 2018

Table of Contents

Introduction and Context for the Report		1
I. Appropriate Placement of the Writing Program within the University	3	
II. Building on Cross-Curricular Collaborations Already Begun by the Writing Program	6	
III. Needed Research and Data Collection for Development of University Writing	8	
IV. Contracts and Salaries of Writing Studies Lecturers	9	
V. Appropriate Hires of Tenure-line Faculty and “Faculty of Practice”	9	
VI. Teaching Loads of Lecturers	10	
VII. Additions to Course Offerings and Possible Addition of Writing Major and Minor	11	
Conclusion		12
References		13
Appendix A	15	
Appendix B	16	

Introduction and Context for the Report

On November 12-14, 2018, Professors Chris Thaiss and Barbara Cambridge¹ visited the University of Miami (UofM) for the purpose of reviewing its English Composition Program (ECP), currently housed in the English Department. The visit was arranged through the Council of Writing Program Administrators (CWPA) Consultant-Evaluator Service; Thaiss and Cambridge are appointed evaluators for this service. Arrangements for the visit were made by Professor Shirley Rose, Director of the WPA Consultant-Evaluator Service, in consultation with Dr. Leonidas Bachas, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and Dr. Joanna Johnson, Senior Lecturer of English and Director of Writing at UofM.

Prior to our visit, we received an ECP self-study, which included an overview of the ECP's personnel, writing curriculum, other services to the campus, staffing information, specific challenges, and other details. We also received a copy of the report of a prior Consultant-Evaluator Service visit, which had been conducted in 2009. Further, we received a summary of results from a survey conducted in 2018 of non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty in the ECP. At our request, we also received a copy of a proposal regarding the future of the ECP that had been written by Dr. Johnson. The self-study report identified the following areas for review: "optimal institutional structure and placement, alignment with national standards and best practices in teaching and supporting undergraduate and graduate writing, faculty enfranchisement, faculty compensation and teaching load, curriculum, hiring, and autonomy." The self-study identified the primary goal for the visit: "The primary goal of this visit is for the WPA consultant-evaluators to advise on structure and institutional location for a writing program, department or unit that best serves a university-wide community of an R1 institution." We have used these identified items to structure our review.

We wish to thank the many faculty, students, and administrators we met during our visit to UofM. In particular, we thank the following administrators who met with us during our time on campus: Jeffrey Duerk, Provost; William Green, Senior Vice Provost; Leonidas Bachas, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences; Jennifer Ferriss-Hill, Senior Associate Dean; Tim Watson, Chair, English Department; Chantel Acevedo, Professor, English; Evelina Galang, Director, Creative Writing; John Funchion, Director, English Department Graduate Studies; Joel Nickels, Director of Undergraduate Studies, English; April Mann, Director, Writing Center; Kurt Voss-Hoynes, Interim Assistant Director, Writing Center; Roxane Pickens, Assistant Director, Learning Commons; Susan Morgan, Associate Provost for Research Development and Strategy and Professor, Department of Communication Studies; Tatiana Perriño, Associate Dean Graduate School and Associate Professor, Public Health Sciences.

We thank the many members of the faculty of the English Composition Program who met with us over several meetings, as well as members of faculties across disciplines. We thank the graduate students we met who serve as graduate teaching assistants in English 105 and 106 and

¹ Brief biographies of Professors Cambridge and Thaiss are included as Appendix A to this report.

in the Writing Center. In addition, we thank the undergraduate students from across the disciplines who shared their experiences in ENG 105, 106, and 107.

We thank especially Joanna Johnson (Director of Writing) and Adina Sanchez-Garcia (Associate Director), for their assistance during our visit. We also thank Rose-Ketlie Glemaud for her assistance with arrangements before, during, and after our visit.

This report is divided into specific sections covering different areas of the composition program and related programs. Each section features our recommendations and offers commentary on specific challenges and opportunities. We emphasize from the start that the writing program has a great deal to commend it; our report details ways that the program--with appropriate placement and administrative support within the structure of the University--can build on its strengths and connections to other units of the campus toward the goal of developing a strong and prominent writing culture throughout the University.

I. Appropriate Placement of the Writing Program within the University

Recommendation: *Establish a writing studies program outside of the English Department and develop it as an independent unit.*

Since the previous CWPA review of the writing (composition) program at the University of Miami in 2009, there has been no appreciable change in the status of the writing studies faculty and no serious attempt to address the recommendations made at that time about the placement of the program in the University. The composition program continues to generate the great majority (more than 70%) of the FTE in the English Department, but there are no tenure-line faculty in the discipline of writing studies (AKA rhetoric and composition), and the lecturers who deliver these essential courses to UofM students are not allowed to vote on any departmental matters, even including their own curriculum and personnel matters regarding their own faculty.

When finally a survey was undertaken of the composition faculty in the most recent year to ascertain their attitudes on essential issues of governance, results indicated overwhelming desire for autonomy over curriculum and personnel, views reinforced by our meetings with composition faculty over the two days of our visit.

Meanwhile, most writing studies programs in U.S. research universities have left behind in recent decades this legacy of inferior status in English departments, although U.S. English departments vary in their progress toward the autonomy and equal status emphatically desired (and we feel merited) by the lecturers at Miami. Universities have recognized the burgeoning of research in the discipline of writing studies and the importance of encouraging research in the design and administration of writing programs that affect all departments in universities. Tenure-line positions in writing programs are routinely advertised as requiring terminal degrees in writing studies (often with the addendum of "or related disciplines") and such positions have been a growth area in English departments, even as new or replacement positions in other areas of English studies have greatly declined. Even as the number of majoring students in traditional literature

departments has fallen, sometimes drastically, majors and minors in writing studies have sprung up successfully, as students realize the importance to their futures of competence and virtuosity in communication—written, oral, and visual—increasingly more of it highly technological. Writing scholarship and curriculum have responded with increasingly sophisticated and multi-modal courses and program designs. (See References, “Writing Redefined Multi-modally.”)

Equally important, writing-across-the-curriculum programming has recognized the interconnectedness of disciplines in this endeavor to communicate disciplinary discoveries both within disciplinary research communities and to broader publics. Many of the advertised tenure-line and administrative positions in writing studies emphasize the cross-curricular mandate of the work of writing programs.

Even as this English department has failed continually to recognize this potential in its composition faculty, we have been impressed by the efforts of this writing studies faculty and its leaders to establish connections with other schools and departments, as described below. We feel strongly that if and when this program is separated from the English department, this faculty—augmented by strategic hires and promotions to increase its research and administrative capacity—can become a shining light for the University, potentially a nationally recognized writing program, if sufficiently supported.

To grow this asset, separation from English is vital, if the writing program is to reach its potential on behalf of Miami students. In our many visits to research universities, both as part of the Consultant-Evaluator Service and via conferences and consultations, we have rarely encountered so unhealthy a personnel situation as we have met here. In part, as our conversations with tenure-line (TL) English faculty revealed, the fall in majors and in literature FTE overall has exacerbated the strain in relations between the composition faculty and the TL faculty. This decline has created a competitive environment for FTE and for development of new courses that has made it even less likely that English will grant the autonomy, much less equality, desired by the ECP faculty.

We note that the current, still new, English chair has made some small moves to feature writing studies in more prominent ways. Aware of Department opposition to writing faculty participation in Department business, he has, nonetheless, placed the writing faculty on the Department listserv, acknowledges that full-time writing faculty need voting rights, and sees the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee as needing equal representation of literature, creative writing, and writing studies faculty. He recognizes that these “bandaid solutions,” however, do not achieve the Department’s need to focus on its current diminishing number of majors in literature and creative writing and the University’s need for more writing classes in majors across the School of Arts and Sciences and beyond. Moreover, although the Chair has shown this willingness to ameliorate some injuries to morale, equity, and growth potential in the composition program, the pattern over the years of systematic withholding of interest, recognition, initiative, and authority has poisoned any possibility of trust by writing studies faculty in whatever English might now attempt.

The question now is what is the best placement of the writing studies program within the structure of the University. We have heard several ideas during our visit: (1) a separate program or department within Arts and Sciences; (2) inclusion as a program or department in the School of Communication; (3) central placement as a program or department reporting to the Provost. We appreciate the thinking by the Provost, the Dean of Arts and Sciences, and the Senior Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education to derive a solution that benefits most stakeholders. We know that whatever solution is decided upon will require sacrifices for all existing units and will not be immediately comfortable. But the example of numerous programs across the U.S. shows that workable solutions can be achieved.

Our experience over many years suggests that successful placement of programs is mostly a matter of reporting lines and administrative structures in given institutions. No situation is ideal or perfect. But whatever is decided must ensure the freedom and incentive for the program to develop toward its potential to serve the undergraduate and graduate student populations across disciplines and to collaborate with the schools and colleges (as will be described below).

As noted above, many English departments have evolved over the years to recognize the vital importance—and potential—of writing studies programs and thus to include writing studies faculty (e.g., in professional and technical writing, in nonfiction writing, in writing-in-disciplines concentrations, in programs for multilingual writers, etc.) as equal partners in developing the new English department. More than 100 such departments have developed majors in writing studies (often with rhetoric in the title) and many more have created minors. See the website of the CCCC Committee on the Major in Writing for a partial list

(<http://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/committees/majorrhetcomp>). In such forward-thinking English departments, tenure-line positions in writing studies are common and have tended to increase with demand for courses and research, while NTT faculty are given full voting privileges and reasonable working conditions (an issue we address below). Writing programs are thus allowed to develop in ways that meet best practices nationally. (See the CCCC Policy Statement, “Principles for the Postsecondary Teaching of Writing,” <http://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/postsecondarywriting> .)

Increasingly, however, in U.S. research universities where literature-dominant English faculties have been unwilling to move forward in this way, the more common solution has been to separate the writing studies program from the English department, and to create an independent program or department. (See <http://wpacouncil.org/iwdpa> for a partial list of programs and departments, those which have joined the Independent Writing Departments and Programs Affiliate of the Council of Writing Program Administrators.)

Given what we have observed in reading the reports and visiting with informants at Miami, we feel that independence will be a more workable option here than would be inclusion of the writing studies faculty in a different school or department, such as Communication. We would not wish to see the program subjugated in just a different already-established structure. More important, we have been highly impressed by the leadership of the writing

program: their knowledge of trends in U.S. writing program development, their persistent efforts to build collaborations with other colleges and schools at UofM, and their well-informed dedication to the needs of students both in the first year and as students proceed to graduation. In meeting with the NTT faculty, we noted also their strong support of the leadership of the writing program.

Further, we note highly favorably the many years experience at Miami of the writing studies faculty we met. The University is blessed with a solid core of experienced full-time writing faculty who are ready to take on the challenges of building an independent unit, whether that unit remains in Arts and Sciences or reports more centrally to the Office of the Provost. A good deal of the passion that we heard expressed by the writing studies faculty for necessary autonomy derives from the ongoing efforts they have made to build relationships with other schools and colleges at UofM on behalf of students majoring in these fields. It also comes from the instrumental relationship the program has already built with the Writing Center, which brings faculty into one-to-one mentoring contact with students from across the University.

II. Building on Cross-Curricular Collaborations Already Begun by the Writing Program

Recommendation: *Move toward a “vertical curriculum” that furthers student writing/communication development through the undergraduate years, led by the writing studies program and implemented across the University. Current cross-curricular collaborations provide a base and point to possibilities that will distinguish the University of Miami throughout higher education.*

The writing studies program has already made strides to develop 100- and 200-level courses in collaboration with schools such as engineering, business, and medicine. For example, we were very impressed by what we heard from a group of undergraduate STEM majors about English 107, the second-term writing course in STEM. The multi-modal assignments that help students learn both how to communicate successfully in their own disciplines and to reach broader, less-specialized readers seem a model for how such courses can be developed and designed.

We would like to see this trend encouraged, with the aim of building a “vertical curriculum” that provides resources to students in the upper division. Ways to do this include a well-articulated and systematically administered WAC/WID program across courses in all fields taught by faculty in the various disciplines. In more and more universities, this model also includes upper-level writing courses taught by writing studies faculty and focused on the diverse rhetorical and research needs of specific areas of the curriculum (writing in science, writing in engineering, writing in business, writing in the health professions, etc.). (See References, “WAC/WID Development.”)

Further, the independent writing program, once authorized, could build on other collaborative efforts already enjoying success at UofM. Five examples point to current undergirding or expanding of beneficial practices:

1. Faculty and students with whom we talked expressed support for 200-level classes in writing that focus on specific categories of majors. In the future these classes could be expanded in number and in integration within majors. In some institutions, such classes are taught by faculty funded by both the writing program and the department itself, especially when majors require a writing course in the discipline. A common model is to have some discipline-oriented writing courses taught and funded by the writing program, while other discipline-specific courses (often designated “writing-intensive” or “writing in the major” courses) are funded by the departments that offer them, as, for example, the “W” courses are already funded at UofM. The University of California, Davis, and George Mason University are examples of institutions that have over many years successfully operated writing programs that feature this division of responsibility for vertical writing curricula.

2. Teaching Circles were unanimously extolled as helpful within current writing faculty practice and by both writing program faculty and participants in other disciplines. Current support of re-assigned time for the leader of a circle is laudatory, a practice that could be spread across disciplines as a vertical curriculum is developed.

3. The Summer Institute for Writing to Learn corresponds with good practice on many campuses, in that faculty can learn from one another while developing curricula and practices for their own teaching. We heard from a number of faculty members whose knowledge base blossomed and commitment to writing in their courses multiplied during these institutes. One interviewee called the Summer Institute “an invisible asset.”

4. The Writing Center plays a central role in the University in supporting both students and faculty. The close linkage between the Center and the ECP is a definite asset for the University. In the latest set of statistics, the Center served 35% first-year students, not all in writing classes, and 33% graduate students in multiple disciplines, as well as faculty members from across the University. Writing retreats, writing consultations, and succinct thesis topic identification all benefit grad students. Faculty for whom English is a second language benefit from the Center, but could use even more support if the Center in cooperation with the writing program were funded for that purpose. The current healthy contribution to writing across the disciplines could be linked more and more to writing courses in multiple disciplines, especially with additional faculty teaching in the Center and additional funding from multiple schools.

5. Writing studies has designed a cognate that can be generative as soon as the writing program is independent. Currently the English department requires that two of the three courses be in literature and creative writing. When that requirement is gone, the other two courses designated might be a lower-division writing course in the discipline and an upper-division course in a narrowed

specialty in the discipline. The cognate program fits nicely with a vertical curriculum in writing.

The professional organizations for writing studies teachers and scholars, including the Conference on College Composition and Communication, the Council of Writing Program Administrators, the Association of Teachers of Technical Writing, the WAC Clearinghouse/Association for Writing Across the Curriculum, etc.—provide many models and resources to help newer independent programs develop such collaborative curricula in the ways most beneficial to their institutions.

In whatever ways an independent writing studies program would further develop such collaborations, we are confident that this faculty—augmented by judicious promotions and new hires—can become a program or department that can gain national prominence as it serves Miami students.

III. Needed Research and Data Collection for Development of University Writing

Recommendation: *The University needs to conduct institutional research in order to answer basic questions about the status, quality, and components of writing curricula across the campus. The Office of the Provost, in consultation with the writing program, should be involved in support of this research.*

Although we had access to some data about writing at the University of Miami, systematic collection of data across the campus would both surface current practices and requirements in writing instruction and provide bases for development of the writing curriculum vertically through the undergraduate years. Multiple people whom we interviewed indicated interest in more data on which to make decisions about curriculum and instruction. For example, Dean Bachas asked, “How much writing is occurring on this campus?” No one has a complete answer to that question. Throughout our visit, other questions emerged with no current answers. Examples include the following:

1. Since W courses were established, little knowledge is available about how their content matches needs in the disciplines. What kinds of writing will a student in each discipline do? How are students instructed in disciplinary-specific writing forms? What kinds of writing responses and evaluations are used?
2. Do faculty across campus have awareness of the precise kinds of Writing Center help available and their actual application? Are current Writing Center instructors knowledgeable about major-specific writing practices?
3. How would faculty in specific disciplines benefit from knowing the effects of new and emerging digital communication tools for writing, research, and teaching?

4. How do graduating students and alumni rate the importance of writing in their education at UofM? What is the importance of writing to graduates as they proceed in their professional and civic lives post graduation?

Outcomes of data collection could be shared across campus, at professional meetings, and in research funding applications. For example, the National Science Foundation is currently giving substantial grants for research projects on writing. The Provost could signal the University's commitment to writing in all majors by funding major initial data collection and then projects based on the data that would be useful in campus curriculum development. Vocal and monetary supports from the leader of a campus are both significant for acceptance and in support of change.

IV: Contracts and Salaries of Writing Studies Lecturers

Recommendation: *Raise starting salaries of lecturers and include continuing (non-term) contracts.*

The NTT lecturers of the program will continue to be its backbone going forward. Their expertise in reaching and even inspiring undergraduate students—and mentoring new graduate student teachers—needs to be rewarded and incentivized. We recommend that efforts be made to raise their starting salaries to the level of other universities in the region, and raises should be based both on across-the-board and on merit adjustments.

Similarly, the system of one-year contracts, with the possibility of three-year contracts only for senior lecturers, needs to be revisited. From our experience and from recognizing the many years that so many of these lecturers have served the University, we recommend that senior status mean *continuing contracts with no maximum term and with stepped raises based on performance*. In an independent writing studies program, the faculty will be able to develop their own rigorous, well-informed standards and procedures for determining senior status, as well as for the annual reviews of those on one-year contracts. Similarly, the independent program will be well-positioned to design the regular performance reviews (perhaps on a three-year cycle) of senior lecturers with continuing appointments, in order to determine raises.

V. Appropriate Hires of Tenure-line Faculty and “Faculty of Practice”

Recommendation: *Make tenure-line hires and “faculty of practice” hires in writing studies that further the teaching, research, and administrative goals of the independent program.*

That up to five “faculty of practice” hires have been already recommended for the writing studies program is a step in the right direction, but the current NTT faculty is uncertain how to interpret the effect of such hires on their own status and opportunities for advancement. It is essential that such hires be designed and described so that overall incentive and opportunities for the current faculty be increased and that imposing yet another layer of hierarchy be avoided.

We strongly recommend that hiring of tenure-line faculty in writing studies be a priority. Such hires will signal to the Faculty Senate the importance of the program. Even more important, such hires will enable the program to build the national reputation of the UofM in writing studies through the research productivity and national professional service required of these faculty. As in most writing programs, tenured ranks (Associate and Full) should include the promise of service in important administrative posts, such as Director of the Program, Director of Writing Across the Curriculum, or Director of the Writing Center. (However, NTT faculty should not be excluded from administrative posts, as long as they receive appropriate release time.)

The rank, research, and publication expectations of tenure-line positions should be clearly defined in line with policy statements on these issues from the Council of Writing Program Administrators and the Conference on College Composition and Communication. When Assistant Professor positions are opened, the research expectations should be clearly defined in order to justify a teaching load (ideally, 4 courses per year) less than that of lecturers. Assistant professors should not be given administrative responsibilities that will hinder their research and publication agendas until tenure.

VI. Teaching Loads of Lecturers

Recommendation: *Reduce current teaching loads of lecturers to keep overall student load within national guidelines.*

The University of Miami is relatively unique in its dividing lecturer teaching between courses and service in the Writing Center. The lecturers we met tend to like this division of responsibility, but find the requirement of ten hours per week in the Writing Center unduly cumbersome in terms of scheduling. Moreover, the standard of four courses per term exceeds the student load of 60 per term recommended by the CCCC. Note the following wording from the CCCC Statement on Working Conditions of NTT Faculty:

NTT faculty workloads should be limited to a maximum twenty students per section of first-year and/or advanced composition courses and a maximum fifteen students per section of basic (or “remedial”) writing courses. Generally, NTT faculty should not teach more than three sections of such courses per term. If TT/T faculty teaching loads exceed three sections of first-year, advanced, or basic writing courses per term or exceed the class size recommendations, NTT faculty teaching loads should be consistent with those of TT/T faculty. NTT faculty should not teach larger sections of the same course as TT/T faculty.

(<https://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/working-conditions-ntt>)

Some UofM writing studies faculty suggested a load of three courses per term and three hours per week in the Center as a workable compromise. We like this suggestion and recommend that it be implemented.

VII. Additions to Course Offerings and Possible Addition of Writing Major and Minor

Recommendations: *Reconsider the purpose and objectives of English 106. Develop an array of required and optional writing courses within the writing program and within departments and schools across the university. Consider a writing major and a writing-in-disciplines minor.*

More attention needs to be given to the content and relationships of English 103, 105, 106, and 107. (Note: In an independent writing program, the prefix of these and additional courses will need to be changed, e.g., to WRIT.). We question especially the variety of pedagogical approaches and writing assignments in 106. Much commentary about 105 and 106 by English department members related to the need of English graduate students to have classes to teach, not to the ways in which undergraduate students' learning needs can be served. Although it is important for faculty members to use their own abilities and knowledge bases in their teaching of 106, this course taken by so many students needs more coordination, somewhat greater standardization, and better-defined linkage to needs of students in all disciplines. The faculty of the independent writing program can re-design 106 so that it meets agreed-on objectives. The current graduate practicum courses and the Teaching Circles can be relied on to help all faculty and the graduate student instructors adapt to the new course requirements and learning outcomes through comparisons of teaching strategies and student work.

Course 107, on the other hand, seems well conceived and implemented, as noted earlier. One lecturer in another discipline but with background in writing studies stated that weak critical thinking skills in an engineering fundamentals class resulted in a 30% attrition rate. She recommends 107 as a required course for engineering majors (with the addition of an upper division course in writing in engineering). The undergraduate students we met spoke highly of learning in 107 and their ability to apply what they learned in other classes.

Various advanced writing courses already offer important learning to students. A striking example is a 231 course that links with a sociology course, featuring letter exchanges with inmates in a local prison and analysis of this interchange. Toward developing other courses at this level, instructors need to feel encouragement and support to design and offer them. Providing this incentive should be a priority in an independent writing program. Also, students who want to take an individualized study course with a writing studies faculty member should be allowed to do so.

Further, student-driven, project-oriented 400-level courses that feature substantial writing are ripe for development in multiple disciplines. Faculty that we met, not just in writing studies but also in several other disciplines, mentioned the efficacy of a writing studies minor for students to learn and to market themselves for positions upon graduation.

So many colleges and universities now offer writing majors and minors (as noted earlier on p. 5) that the University of Miami has a multitude of published resources and collaborative faculty at other institutions to consult. Publications by the National Council of Teachers of English are pertinent to multiple disciplines. Some schools have chosen to send multi-disciplinary teams to the NCTE annual conference or the Conference on College

Composition and Communication conference to learn the lay of the land. An associate provost at Indiana University Purdue University sponsored teams for several years as the writing program there supported more and more strongly writing in every discipline. Speakers and workshop leaders, such as Anne Ruggles Gere, who spoke at UofM during this past year, can focus on the broad concept of writing in disciplines or very focused topics like writing book reviews, writing about a research outcome for a public audience, helpful comments on student papers, and composing an argument for funding.

Conclusion

The recommendations described in this report build on current conditions on the University of Miami campus and point to goals that the University is quite capable of achieving. To do so requires collaboration from administrators at all levels and from faculty in all disciplines. We are impressed that the University recognizes the centrality of writing in the education of students and wants to support development of student thinking through written expression and development of broadly-based, technologically-savvy, multi-modal writing/communication skills. We are impressed by how many of those with whom we spoke want to be part of changes necessary to accent the importance of writing so that students graduating from UofM contribute to their occupations and to society—and have a level of self understanding and expression that accents them as individuals.

We wish students, faculty members, and administrators the best as they make important decisions about writing studies at UofM. We are pleased to have had the opportunity to contribute to the thinking involved in change making and will eagerly watch for initiatives that demonstrate your decisions.

References

Writing Redefined Multimodally

D. Dryer, D. Bowden, B. Brunk-Chavez, S. Harrington, B. Halbritter, and K. Yancey. "Revising FYC Outcomes for a Multimodal, Digitally Composed World: The WPA Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition (Version 3.0). *WPA: Writing Program Administration*. 38.1 (2014): 129-143. <http://wpacouncil.org/archives/38n1/38n1dryer-bowden.pdf>

T. Bowen and C. Whithaus. *Multimodal Literacies and Emerging Genres*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 2013.

C. Lutkewitte, ed. *Multimodal Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2013.

J. Palmeri. *Remixing Composition: A History of Multimodal Writing Pedagogy*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2012.

C. Selfe, ed. *Multimodal Composition: Resources for Teachers*. New York, NY: Hampton Press, 2007.

J. Shipka. *Toward A Composition Made Whole*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2011.

Sweetland Digital Rhetoric Collaborative. <http://www.digitalrhetoriccollaborative.org/>

WAC/WID Development (Vertical Curriculum)

WAC Clearinghouse (multiple resources, including journals and book series).
<https://wac.colostate.edu/books/>

M. Cox, D. Melzer, and J. Galin. *Sustainable WAC*. National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), 2018.

C. Thaiss and S. McLeod, "Writing in the Disciplines and across the Curriculum," In K. Schick, A. Rupiper, B. Hessler, eds. *A Guide to Composition Pedagogies*. 2nd Ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014, 283-300.

S. McLeod, E. Miraglia, M. Soven, C. Thaiss, eds. *WAC for the New Millennium*. NCTE, 2001. (Available with open access on the WAC Clearinghouse)

Independent Writing Programs

R. Matzen and M. Abraham, eds. *Weathering the Storm: Independent Writing Programs in the Age of Austerity*, forthcoming from Utah State University Press, scheduled 2019.

J. Everett and C. Hanganu-Bresch, eds. *A Minefield of Dreams: Triumphs and Travails of Independent Writing Programs*. WAC Clearinghouse, 2016.

P. O'Neill, A. Crow, and L. Burton, eds. *A Field of Dreams: Independent Writing Programs and the Future of Composition Studies*. Utah State UP, 2002.

NTT Faculty and Labor Issues

“Bibliography of Resources on Labor in College Composition.”

<http://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/labor/bibliography>

“CCCC Statement on Working Conditions for Non-Tenure-Track Writing Faculty.”

<http://cccc.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/working-conditions-ntt>

Appendix A: Brief Biographies of the External Evaluators

Dr. Barbara Cambridge is professor emerita at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis. At IUPUI she served sequentially as Director of the Writing Center, Director of Writing Across the Curriculum, Associate Chair of the English Department, and Associate Dean of the University. Indiana's governor appointed her as the first faculty member on the Indiana Higher Education Commission. Subsequently, for twenty years in Washington, DC, she was Director of Assessment, Director of Teaching, and Vice President of the American Association for Higher Education, and she established and directed the Washington office of the National Council of Teachers of English. Cambridge served early in her career as President of the Indiana Teachers of Writing and later in that role for the Council of Writing Program Administrators and for the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. A co-founder and director of the International Coalition for Electronic Portfolio Research, she also served on the boards of two US accrediting bodies: the Western Association of Schools and Colleges and the Coalition for Assessment of Educator Preparation. Cambridge has published on teaching writing, administering programs, collaboration across campuses, the scholarship of teaching and learning, and electronic portfolios at the classroom, college and university, and national levels.

Dr. Chris Thaiss is Professor Emeritus of Writing Studies in the University Writing Program (UWP) at the University of California, Davis. The first permanent director of the independent UWP (2006-11), he has taught undergraduate courses in writing in disciplines and professions, as well as graduate courses in writing studies pedagogy, theory, research, and program administration. Active in the development of cross-curricular writing in colleges and universities since 1978, Thaiss coordinated the International Network of WAC Programs (2005-15) and frequently consults on writing and conducts workshops on teaching and program development nationally and internationally. Before coming to UC Davis in 2006, Thaiss taught for 30 years at George Mason University, where he directed the Writing Center, the Composition Program, and Writing across the Curriculum, and chaired the Department of English. From 2012 to 2015, he directed the UC Davis Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL), and from 2012 to 2016 he served as Chair of the PhD Designated Emphasis in Writing, Rhetoric, and Composition Studies. The author, co-author, or editor of twelve books, Thaiss serves on the editorial boards of *Across the Disciplines*, the WAC Clearinghouse, and *Writing on the Edge*, and reviews for *College Composition and Communication* and the international *Journal of Writing Research*. His latest project is a textbook for writing in STEM Disciplines, *Writing Science in the 21st Century*, forthcoming from Broadview Press. Additional information is available at <http://thaiss.ucdavis.edu>.

Appendix B: About the CWPA Consultant-Evaluator Service

The Council of Writing Program Administrators is a national association of college and university faculty with professional responsibilities or interests as directors of writing programs. Operating on a method similar to regional accreditation agencies, WPA evaluations have several stages. WPA requests a written program self-study, sends a team of two trained consultant-evaluators to campus for interviews and on-site evaluation, and then compiles a final report. A six-month follow-up report from the campus completes the process. The select panel of WPA consultant-evaluators comprises leaders in the field of composition. They come from four-year colleges, community colleges, and universities. All are experienced writing program administrators and recognized scholars with a national perspective on composition teaching and program administration; several are past presidents of the organization. As evaluators, their primary goal is to determine a program's unique strengths and weaknesses, not to transform all writing programs into their own. They recognize that every program must retain its individual character, serve a particular community, and solve special problems. The director of this program is Dr. Shirley Rose, Arizona State University. Dr. Rose reports on the CE program to the WPA Executive Board, which oversees its operation. Its Associate Director is Dr. Michael Pemberton, Director of the University Writing Center at Georgia Southern University. WPA website: www.wpacouncil.org