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From May 1 to May 3, 2007, the External Review Committee visited the UCSC campus and spent time with many of the different constituencies that make up the larger university community. We are very grateful to those who so carefully planned and arranged our visit and for the thoughtfulness and generosity of those who met with us. In particular, we would like to thank Norma Ray for all her help.

In our conversations with very disparate groups, we were struck by the convergence of a deep commitment to the ideals and traditions of the university with a thoughtful and flexible approach to the challenges that changing demographics and new realities pose. The challenges facing the Writing Program seem to focus on four salient issues: an increase in populations requiring more introductory support for writing and the resources needed to provide those services, a desire to sustain the intellectual excellence of the freshman composition course across the ten colleges with their independent missions and separate administrative structures, a need to rebuild programs, particularly for the W requirement, after severe budget cuts have gutted those initiatives, and finally a changing faculty as retirements take their toll on the leadership of the Program. The attached report addresses the specific questions we were given to consider.
1. Academic Staff

Quality The External Review Committee finds that the quality of the academic staff in the Writing Program is superb; the faculty have maintained a very high quality of instruction, and have soldiered on in the face of the cuts to the Program, which we understand were budget-driven. These faculty are a seriously underutilized resource for the campus. Faculty morale\(^1\) is remarkably high, given the situation; we were greatly impressed with their professionalism, their collegiality, and the collaborative way they work, especially with regard to establishing outcomes for their curricula and establishing agreed-upon standards for student work.

The last external review of the UCSC Writing Program, conducted in 1999, stated that it was “the most distinctive and outstanding program in the UC system” and ranked “with the very best Writing Programs in the United States” \(^2\). Unfortunately, that is no longer the case, in part because the academic staff is so underutilized. The Writing Program has gone from a full-service one (providing courses at both the entry-level and upper division and consulting with faculty across the disciplines to develop “W” classes) to a program that focuses on entry-level instruction, a change that has reduced the Program to a model that was out of date 25 years ago. This is especially unfortunate in the light of UCSC’s “uncommon commitment to undergraduate education.”

The best programs across the country have gone to the model that UCSC used to have: guided practice in writing for students throughout their college careers, gradually moving from an introduction to academic writing to very focused writing in the disciplines. Various longitudinal research studies show the wisdom of this approach. Writing is not a closed skill, like learning to ride a bicycle; it is an open skill, more like learning to play an instrument, always open to improvement and refinement. Further, there is no Platonic form of “good writing,” as recent research in writing in the disciplines has shown: writing in the sciences is very different from writing in the humanities. Students become “good writers” in a disciplinary context, as they learn what constitutes data and how to shape arguments in specific areas of study; writing across the curriculum programs were established so that students could receive guided practice in disciplinary writing, rather than learning (or not learning) by trial and error. We understand that the Academic Senate has recently reaffirmed faculty commitment to the “W” general education requirement; the expertise of the Writing Program faculty will be wasted unless they are part of the effort to make the “W” requirement a meaningful one.

Budget MOU and Workload We hope that the new budget MOU, along with the proposed workload policy, will enable the Program to regain some lost ground; we fully endorse both proposals.

Future Directions There are also some interesting opportunities ahead as some of the present permanent faculty retire. How to craft the positions for new Senate faculty will be an issue that

\(^1\) We are not able to comment on the morale of graduate student instructors, since none of them came to the meeting scheduled with us.
the Program, together with the administration, should think through carefully. On the one hand, there are arguments to be made for hiring ladder faculty, as other UC campuses (Davis, Irvine, Riverside, San Diego, and Santa Barbara) have done. Research faculty not only raise the national profile of a program, they also bring expertise in areas that can be applied immediately to the program and its pedagogy. Further, the present job market for faculty with expertise in rhetoric and composition is a seller’s market; new PhDs routinely receive multiple offers, and senior faculty have to be actively recruited. In such a market, LSOE positions are less desirable than ladder positions; further the LSOE designation is not understood outside the UC system, being often mistaken for a temporary lectureship. On the other hand, the present mix of LSOE and NSF seems to be working very well, and Program faculty expressed strong reservations about bringing in ladder faculty, since they sensed that this might disrupt the collegiality and collaboration that is clearly a hallmark of the program. The Review Committee sees this collegiality as an important value, one that we would not want to see compromised.

What we recommend, therefore, is a series of discussions involving the Writing Program, the administration, and faculty from other writing programs to help shape a plan for the future of the UCSC Writing Program. (UC Davis, for example, invited a series of composition experts from across the country to consult with faculty and give invited talks before hiring a Senate faculty member to direct the UCD Writing Program.) At the national level, the trend is toward separate writing programs becoming departments and developing a writing major. Is this the direction that the UCSC Writing Program should go? Or should the Program maintain its distinct identity as a key part of the liberal arts ethos of UCSC? The answers to these questions will help determine what sorts of Senate hires should be made in the next few years.

One staffing issue that drew our attention was the fact that in some colleges, the Writing Lecturer who serves as coordinator for the ELWR is drawn from a pool of temporary hires. To assure continuity in the instruction and evaluation of ELWR students, the college coordinators should have continuing positions as members of the Writing Program faculty and work closely with the other college coordinators.

Recommendations (Academic Staff):

1.1 The External Review Committee strongly endorses the proposed budget MOU and the proposed workload policy. Taken together, the two proposals should remove some of the conditions that have forced the program to focus only on lower-division courses and enable them to engage in outreach activities, especially for the “W” classes.

1.2 In order to think through the sorts of Senate faculty hires that will be made in the next few years, the Writing Program should be involved in a planning process that would involve discussions with the administration and with national composition experts in order to determine what the best direction is for the Writing Program, given the distinct mission of UCSC.

2 For example, UC Irvine advertised in 2005-06 to replace its LSOE director of composition, an advertisement that occasioned negative comments on the listserv of the Council of Writing Program Administrators because the LSOE designation was taken to be an adjunct position. The search failed, and was successful the following year after it was advertised at the Associate Professor level.
1.3 The University should consider making all College Writing Coordinators members of the Writing Program faculty.

2. Curriculum

Transparency The recent changes in the campus general education requirements and consequent curricular changes in the core writing program seem to us to be an improvement, a move toward ensuring that entering students take core courses that, whatever the topic, have the same outcomes in mind in terms of developing academic reading and writing skills.

While we did not have the opportunity to ask students about how well they understood the general education and writing requirements now in force, it may be worthwhile to note that three of us – full professors in English and Directors of Writing Programs ourselves, two of us from other UC campuses – had some difficulty in mastering the terminology, as well as in trying to figure out how the ELWR was fulfilled. The Writing 1 and Writing 2 and C1 and C2 designations pose a complication that seems unnecessary, especially given the fact that the latter is also termed a “W” course. Perhaps some of the confusion stems from the fact that the curriculum is in a transitional stage, but if we found it difficult to puzzle out, we assume students have similar difficulties. The requirements themselves seem sensible and entirely in line with writing curricula nationally; UCSC might consider simplifying the designations to make them more readily grasped by students.

Relationship between Writing Program and College Core Curriculum In each of the meetings that we attended over two days, the strength of the college system and the commitment to its multiple distinctive identities was evident, yet the challenge of administering a campus requirement across so many different structures was also evident. Our back to back meetings with college provosts and with NSF staff highlighted some of the strains that can emerge when the required college writing course is also the introductory course that socializes the students not just to the university but to the mission of the particular college. Clearly there is some anxiety about who is in charge of the Core courses, and clearly the ways of sharing this responsibility differ markedly from college to college. Indeed, the one group we did not meet was the teachers of the Core courses who are not part of the Writing Program. We understand that in some colleges the Writing Coordinator is closely involved with the hiring of such teachers, while in others this does not happen. Because of the recent reaffirmation that writing is a central concern of the Core, it would seem that a candidate’s expertise in teaching writing should be a factor in the hiring process. In order to help regularize the process, it would be helpful if there were a protocol for newly-appointed provosts to follow when making these hires, one that might involve consultation with the College Writing Coordinator. We understand that there is a high turnover with regard to these particular teachers. It would be helpful in terms of providing continuity for the curriculum if the Writing Program were to offer a joint appointment—that is, the person hired would teach the Core in the Fall Quarter and teach Writing Program courses Winter and Spring.

Assessment The External Review team also understands that an Assessment Project is underway to determine passing standards for C2. We recommend that a writing assessment specialist be invited to campus to consult on assessment procedures that would be most appropriate to UCSC’s particular concerns.

ELWR and ESL Although the Writing Program is responding as well as it can under the circumstances to changes in the student population, the ELWR is at the center of what the
Program’s self-study report describes as a “a perfect storm of inadequate funding.” Shifts in funding policies and changes in demographics have combined to put severe pressure on resources. The budget for ELWR-related courses takes up more and more of the available funds. Where something like 80% of incoming students used to pass the ELWR requirement on entrance, now closer to 66% do so. And the students who do not pass now often require more instruction and more time to meet the requirement. The accommodations being made for ELWR students seem appropriate and intelligent, but they depend on a skilled teaching force. With the coming retirement of 3 of the 4 faculty members with special training in linguistics, the program is going to need more support. While the search for a new ELWR and ELL coordinator with LSOE is certainly going to be one step in the right direction, it seems that even more support for this program will be needed. Here is one place where the Writing Program and the individual colleges must have more carefully delineated strategies for collaboration. Teachers of the ELWR sections need special training. They also need to be able to rely on the effective use of tutors in these classrooms. The tutorial program seems a particularly successful part of the ELWR program, and it is to be hoped that the current system of fee-for-service can be abandoned and a return to assured tutoring services for all ELWR students can be re-instated.

One of the highlights of our visit was the meeting with the undergraduate tutors. They are a wonderful advertisement for the university; we wish we could have captured on videotape their energy, enthusiasm and thoughtfulness. Our meeting with them certainly underscored the power of undergraduate tutors to serve as intermediaries with beginning students. All the tutors agreed about their sense of being helpful to other students and what it means to play that role (“Their accomplishments are yours.” “Best job I ever had.” “It was really, really valuable.”) They also agreed about the great benefits of working closely with Writing Program faculty and how much the actual tutoring had offered them as students. (“It helped me to find a direction.” “I see now that I want to be a teacher.” “I realized how much harder I should work myself.”) The investment in this tutoring has to be money well spent. It is a little that gains a lot.

In 1999 the External Review Committee commented extensively on the singular success of this campus in “helping ESL students satisfy campus writing requirements without assigning those students to the sorts of segregated and stigmatized courses that ESL students on other UC campuses tend to resent and avoid.” The efficacy of this design still holds, but the success is now partially compromised by the increasing class size, the need for faculty development for those teachers of ELWR sections who don’t have formal background in applied linguistics or ELL specifically, and the cut-backs on tutorial support.

Recommendations (Curriculum):

2.1 Consider how to designate the general education writing requirements in ways that are more transparent.

2.2 Some thought should be given to a hiring protocol for all Colleges that would discuss the desired qualifications of and the process for hiring non-Writing Program teachers of the Core courses. More continuity of academic staff would result if these appointments were made jointly and in consultation with the Writing Program.

2.3 More support needs to be given to the program for work with ESL students and those who do not speak English at home.

2.4 Funding for tutorial services should be restored.
3. Administration

Staff Support  It is clear that the one administrative staff person assigned to the Writing Program is overwhelmed by the sheer amount of work required for what is a fairly complicated program. She is continually being diverted from doing her own work because she is often the only one in the office to respond to questions and advise students. Faculty have had to take on staff functions as well, an obvious misuse of resources. Staff and faculty morale inevitably suffers. The External Review team urges that special consideration be taken and that the formula for staff allotments be modified to allow the hiring of a second full-time staff person as well as work study support as needed. The External Review Committee understands that a second full-time staff position has been approved, and when this is filled the situation should improve. A full-time staff of two persons seems a minimum for the program.

One of the issues for the Writing Program in terms of staffing, resources, and equipment is that it is not a department, and therefore does not fit the usual mold for administrative decision-making (for example, it has no majors, but does a lot of advising). Some thought should be given as to how to estimate the needs of the Program outside of the usual funding formulas. Further, because the Writing Program faculty are committed to the College structure of USCS, they have not joined other units in the humanities who have moved their offices into one building, a move that some faculty see as a move away from the focus on the Colleges and toward departments. In some of the Colleges faculty teaching the core courses have support services, but in some they do not have support services or their own offices; it seems only reasonable that all Colleges should provide support and office space for those teaching the core.

Administration of the ELWR The Committee was concerned by the amount of time and energy devoted to administering the ELWR. If the present search for an ELWR Coordinator is successful, that person should be able to take over some of the work involved with that requirement. Still, the number of students at UCSC who have not met the ELWR has been increasing steadily, according to statistics we were given, with an accompanying rise in the administrative work involved in advising, placing, and testing these students. The way that UCSC has chosen to deal with the ELWR—separating the course from the exam—is wise, in that the course itself is not remedial and student motivation is therefore not an issue. However, we were concerned that using the entry-level placement exam at the end of the course as what is in effect an exit exam may not be appropriate. Further, research shows that a timed writing examination discriminates against students whose first language is not English, an increasing group of students in all of California. The Writing Program has dealt with this issue by allowing appeals and portfolios for students who do not pass the exam; while this is in line with assessment practices nationally (because portfolios are a more authentic assessment of the range of student writing abilities), it does add to the administrative workload. It may be that modifications of the present testing and placement system are needed; there is an extensive ongoing national conversation about writing assessment that the Writing Program might join, both to learn from and to instruct others. Inviting a writing assessment expert to campus would be one step in that direction.

Governance  The present quality of Program governance seems excellent; it is an exceptionally collaborative and consultative unit, distributing administrative responsibilities and sharing the workload among NSF and Senate faculty. Such a model ensures that all faculty, regardless of status or level of employment (full- or part-time) are invested in the Program. The present budget situation has meant that the Director has assumed rather more administrative duties than
her released time would allow; the new budget MOU, if approved, should allow the Program to return to a more distributed model.

**Administrative Coordination of W Courses**  One area of administration that the university as a whole might want to consider has to do with the W courses. Since the Academic Senate has just reaffirmed faculty commitment to the writing-intensive courses, the program may want to follow the lead of UC Irvine and hire one person to coordinate these courses into a true WAC program rather than a collection of courses. Given the state of the market at present, this would need to be a senior Senate faculty position.

**Recommendations (Administration):**

3.1 A second staff-support person should be hired immediately. The possibility of hiring work-study students for additional support (reception, answering the phone) should be explored.

3.2 Thought should be given as to an appropriate funding formula for Writing Program resources, since it does not fit the mold for most other units in the university.

3.3 Each College should provide support services and offices for faculty who are teaching the core course in that College.

3.4 The Writing Program should consider inviting an expert in Writing Assessment to campus to discuss ways that the present handling of the ELWR might be streamlined without sacrificing the quality of the present system.

3.5 The Writing Program should consider hiring a Coordinator for W classes, in order to revitalize the WAC program at UCSC.

**4. Future Goals**

**Faculty Development**  While the budget cuts that led to significant curtailments in the Writing Program have certainly taken their toll, there is little question that the energy and commitment of the Writing Program faculty has remained undiminished. A vibrant sense of community characterizes their work together and their own self-study document. The External Review Team attended an after-dinner reading by several faculty members that demonstrated this energy, connection, and playful enjoyment of writing as a community-building activity.

One of the concomitant results of their commitment is the degree to which the Writing Program faculty focus their professional development efforts on immediate, local, or pedagogically related issues. Whether it’s research on UCWRITE or Cross-Age Writing Partnerships, or service on the Santa Cruz County/City Schools Advisory Board, the faculty here involve themselves in the issues that are immediate to their several community affiliations. They are active public intellectuals. This feels like one of the significant strengths of the non-hierarchical academic structure of their program and the shared authority that it has fostered. Noteworthy, too, is the breadth and diversity of the faculty’s training. Poets, psychohistorians, film studies experts, compositionists, linguists, Victorianists, communications specialists, fiction writers, hip-hop analysts, computer technology specialists, videographers — the faculty possesses broad and varied resources for collaboration with other departments and programs.
Given the traditions and the strengths of this pattern of development, it is complicated to imagine what a next move should be. As was noted earlier, ladder faculty positions and a director for the WAC programs would offer certain kinds of status and strength to the program. It would seem wise, however, even if such appointments were made, for those new faculty to build on the shared energy and resourcefulness that the Writing Program now demonstrates in committing itself to a first-class program for beginning students and to a sensitive system for supporting ELWR unsatisfied students while immediately bringing them into the discourse community provided by the Core programs. Additionally, the focus of the Writing Program’s own professional development agenda on local issues, UCSC-related research, is an important part of the tradition here. The commitment to this kind of intellectual work has promoted a particularly self-reflective practice that seems to have gained the Program the deserved respect of other faculty members across the campus.

It is, however, the co-curricular work that seems most sadly to have suffered in the recent budget reallocations. The CPB report on the funding of the Writing Program (2005) remarks on the long history of innovative and highly successful collaborations between the Writing Program and other units, specifically the work on co-teaching W courses. As the campus recommit to the W courses, whose necessity we have already addressed, it seems important that such work be conceived, not as the province of one ladder faculty appointed to superintend such a project, but as a shared venture that builds on the strengths of the existing Writing Program faculty and their relationships with faculty in other units. The Writing Program is in a position to provide support for the upper-division writing requirement if present budget restraints are lifted by resuming their collaboration with colleagues across the disciplines.

Placement of the Writing Program

We were asked to comment on the placement of the Writing Program in the Humanities Division. This is a thorny issue for all institutions where the writing program is not part of an English department. On the one hand, a separate program in fact serves all students, not just those in the Humanities; this fact would suggest that such a program should be funded centrally. On the other hand, writing has historically been located in the Humanities, and most writing teachers have degrees in humanities-related areas. The question really comes down to budget: who should fund a campus-wide program? In some institutions the writing program is funded by an undergraduate dean or vice-provost who oversees all of general education; in others, the allocation for the writing program is made centrally and passed down to the dean. These decisions are site-specific, often determined more by history than by logic. Where the program is located is less important, in our judgment, than how it is funded. The proposed budget MOU would go a long way toward alleviating some of the difficulties the Program has had in the recent past.

Unsolved Problems

Rereading the External Review Report of 1999, one is struck by how many of the issues noted then still remain unresolved: 1) the loss of the upper division writing initiatives; 2) a funding formula that has curtailed Writing Program involvement in that upper division work (and that has now threatened many of the exemplary outreach efforts of this university); 3) the need for more Senate appointments; 4) the need for more staff support. While it seems that the new MOU and the recommitment to the W courses will speak to some of these issues, it is to be hoped that another eight years will not find these same issues worsening.

5. Other

Graduate Student Instructors

Although the meeting with graduate students did not materialize, our discussions with the faculty lead us to believe that they have integrated this new group of
teachers into the Program very well; certainly the curriculum for TA training is an excellent one, in line with national standards for such courses. The funding basis for graduate student instructors clearly should not be through a decrease in the existing budget for Writing Program faculty. Moreover, graduate instructors should not be thought of as replacing the professional staff of highly experienced writing instructors. Instead, graduate students should be given the opportunity to extend their graduate training through the teaching of writing in their disciplines.

*Loss of Journalism Minor*  The External Review team understands that the former journalism minor was popular and highly successful. Restoration of the minor would be beneficial to the campus.
Writing Program Response to the External Review Committee Report  
October 2007

The report of External Review Committee (ERC) members Rise Axelrod, Marjorie Roemer, and Susan McLeod (chair) affirmed many of the choices that the Writing Program has historically made and confirmed as logical and forward-thinking the efforts the program has made to respond to UCSC’s changing demographic and the Writing Program’s changing budgetary circumstances. We are delighted that the ERC sees as strengths what we also see as strengths—a splendid faculty; excellent teaching, lower-division curriculum, and self-governance; and, overall, an effective approach to resolving challenges we see developing in undergraduate students’ writing education. We are thoroughly pleased that the ERC endorses solutions that the Writing Program itself has helped craft, such as the non-Senate faculty Workload Proposal (2005), recent changes to the entry-level writing curriculum, and the re-engineering of the composition requirement into the two-part C1/C2 requirement. And we are gratified that the areas of concern we identified in our Self-Study—among them the underutilization, since the last External Review, of Writing Program faculty in instructional and co-curricular efforts that affect the whole campus (notably the writing-intensive [W] requirement); the challenges facing the program with the imminent retirement of so many of its longstanding faculty; and the promising but incompletely defined relationship between the Writing Program and the colleges in administering the C1/C2 curriculum—have been confirmed by the ERC as worth prompt, close attention. We return to several of these in the next sections of this document.

The ERC report also identifies areas of concern that have since been resolved or are on their way to resolution. These include the following:

- Recommendation 1.2: At the behest of Dean Van Den Abbeele, a task force is now following the ERC’s advice to consult with other campuses on the advantages and disadvantages of filling recently vacated Senate positions with ladder faculty or Lecturers SOE;

- Recommendation 1.3: College Writing Coordinators with more tenuous relationships to the Writing Program have been regularized as Writing Program faculty via bestowal of the “a” equivalency, a one-sixth course equivalency provided to compensate them for participating in regular Program business, and as many courses as we can assign to them annually;

- Recommendation 2.3: The Writing Program has recently hired a specialist in TESOL to strengthen faculty expertise in working with English language learners;

- Recommendation 2.4: Fully-funded tutoring for all ELWR-unsatisfied students has been restored, at least on a trial basis, through a combination of funding provided by VP/DUE Ladusaw and student fees;
• Recommendation 3.1: The Writing Program’s staffing deficit should soon be ameliorated now that the Humanities Division has authorized, conditional upon the Program’s meeting certain conditions, a second 100% staff position.

Though some of these changes were already in progress at the time of the campus visit, nevertheless they represent significant steps forward. Other recommendations are also en route to resolution but are as yet incomplete (e.g., Recommendation 1.1, which endorses the proposed budget MOU and workload policy); still others, which we support, are outside the power of the Writing Program to resolve alone (e.g., Recommendation 3.2, which calls for an “appropriate funding formula for Writing Program resources, since it does not fit the mold for most other units in the university”; and Recommendation 3.3, which calls on the colleges to provide support services for faculty teaching college Core courses).

In the balance of this document, we highlight several key points made by the report and, at the end, respond to or clarify a few others.

The role of the Writing Program at UCSC
In the introduction to its report, the External Review Committee identifies what it sees as the Writing Program’s four main challenges:

an increase in populations requiring more introductory support for writing and the resources needed to provide those services, a desire to sustain the intellectual excellence of the freshman composition course across the ten colleges with their independent missions and separate administrative structures, a need to rebuild programs, particularly for the W requirement, after severe budget cuts have gutted these initiatives, and finally a changing faculty as retirements take their toll on the leadership of the Program. (1)

These points succinctly sum up key challenges. As we noted in our Self-Study and other planning documents, and as the External Review Committee report clearly suggests, together these are effectively campus rather than solely Writing Program concerns: they address issues that affect the education of students across all four years of college.

Though it is a thread that runs through the entire document, the ERC report addresses the campus-level challenge most directly in its first section on “academic staff.” There it indicates that the budget cuts imposed on the Writing Program, and its consequent focus on “entry-level instruction,” have “reduced the Program to a model that was out of date 25 years ago”—an ironic change given that “the best programs across the country have gone to the model that UCSC used to have.” This model involved writing instruction for students at all levels of their academic development (2).

The report’s overall approach, with its emphasis on finding ways to support the W requirement by making use of the “underutilized” Writing Program faculty, supports a return to this integrated model of writing instruction. Under such an integrated model, the main challenges facing the Writing Program, neatly summed up in the four listed
above, would be part of a continuum in which the adequacy of resources for entry-level writers would be considered in tandem with the adequacy of resources and consistency of programs for more advanced writers both within the colleges and across the majors. This is a vision the ERC report articulates in its first recommendation, which “strongly endorses the proposed budget MOU and the proposed workload policy” in order to “remove some of the conditions that have forced the program to focus only on lower-division courses and enable them to engage in outreach activities, especially for the ‘W’ classes” (3).

We hope that the campus considers seriously the External Review Committee’s intention. Although the individual questions posed to the Committee and answered in their report tend to atomize the central question of the role of the Writing Program, the report’s first and most fundamental recommendation concerns a pair of policy changes that, together, may enable the Writing Program once again to serve the campus as a whole—by further developing the entry-level curriculum, working together with the colleges and the departments to strengthen their writing curricula, and hiring faculty members whose work portfolios include responsibility for such programs.

The relationship between the Writing Program and the college Core curricula
In its section on “curriculum,” the ERC report devotes a significant paragraph to the joint administration of the college Core classes by the Writing Program and the colleges. The Writing Program’s commitment to the college Core courses is deep and long-standing, and, through the individual College Writing Coordinators, its involvement in the administration of Core courses long pre-dates the new C1 and C2 requirements. But as the report puts it, “there is some anxiety about who is in charge of the Core courses and clearly the ways of sharing this responsibility differ markedly from college to college” (4). At some colleges, for instance, College Writing Coordinators participate in the hiring of Core instructors; at other colleges, they do not.

The anxiety is no doubt exacerbated by the distribution of responsibility for the requirements. The Writing Program is responsible for the majority of C2 classes but the colleges also run one or two C2 classes apiece each fall which they staff. The Writing Program is responsible for C1 students who are ELWR-unsatisfied, but staffs fewer than half (only 24) of the C1 classes for ELWR-unsatisfied students offered each fall through the Core classes. The remaining ELWR sections of Core classes are staffed by the colleges, which are also responsible for staffing all C1 classes for ELWR-satisfied students. In short, although all C2 classes are responsible for meeting the educational objectives for C2 classes, and likewise all C1 classes are responsible for meeting C1 course objectives, because hiring and oversight for these classes is independently conducted by the Writing Program and the colleges, it is likely that some differences surface in the hiring, training, and reviewing of faculty, meeting the expectations of the curriculum, and so on, especially as shifts take place in the leadership at the colleges and the Writing Program.

The ERC report recommends a two-part solution: first, a “protocol for newly appointed provosts to follow when making these hires, one that might involve consultation with the
College Writing Coordinator” (4); and second, maintaining continuity between the colleges and the Writing Program by having fall Core faculty teach winter and spring Writing Program classes, a practice we already follow to the extent possible. These are fine recommendations that emerge from existing, though not universal, practices.

Perhaps in advance of these recommendations, we suggest another: a committee made up of representatives from the Writing Program, the colleges, and the Committee on Educational Policy and charged with examining the C1/C2 curricula and with recommending protocols for hiring, mentoring, professional development, and evaluation of C1/C2 faculty in order to facilitate curricular and instructional consistency across many units. The Writing Program and the college provosts have a history of excellent collaboration on projects such as these, including the development of the educational expectations for C1 and C2 courses. With the new requirements now in their third year, now would be a good time to review what we have accomplished together and to see where we might further improve the new model.

**Clarifications**

Here we have two corrections and a few points of clarification or divergence from the report’s recommendations:

1. In its comments on the “ELWR and ESL” curriculum, the report mentions a drop in incoming students’ ELWR satisfaction rates from 80% to 66% percent “on entrance” (5). The figures are correct but misapplied. On entrance, in fact, roughly 50% of incoming students are ELWR-satisfied. After the September administration of the Analytical Writing Placement Exam, roughly 60-65% of incoming students annually are ELWR-satisfied. Of the remainder, we have in the last several years seen a drop in the ELWR satisfaction rates at the end of a quarter of UCSC instruction from a historically quite consistent 80% (actually 78%) to 66%.

2. In its discussion of the transparency of the terminology associated with the composition requirements, the ERC report declares that “The Writing 1 and Writing 2 and C1 and C2 designations pose a complication that seems unnecessary, especially given the fact that the latter is also termed a ‘W’ course” (4). Here we have a factual correction: C2 classes cannot also satisfy the W requirement. There are three General Education requirements having to do with writing—C1, C2, and W—and no course satisfies more than one of them.

This statement also raises a slight divergence of opinion: we believe that the nomenclature problem is self-correcting. We acknowledge that the terminology may initially befuddle, but we have not noticed any noteworthy confusion among students, who are accustomed to distinguishing between GE codes and numbered course names. While it is true that each quarter a very small number of students who should enroll in Writing 2 mistakenly enroll in Writing 1 and then quickly correct their enrollments (because of enrollment safeguards the reverse almost never happens), with the imminent graduation of nearly all of the remaining students who must take Writing 1 to satisfy the
old composition requirement, we are very close to retiring the Writing 1 course name, and we believe that should clear up any remaining confusion.

(3) In its discussion of the “administrative coordination of courses,” the ERC report sensibly suggests that a single individual be hired to coordinate the writing-intensive courses “into a true WAC [Writing Across the Curriculum] program rather than a collection of courses,” and recommends that the Writing Program consider making this hire as a “senior Senate faculty position” (7). The Committee makes this recommendation in the belief that such a recruitment would help reestablish the Writing Program’s involvement in writing pedagogy beyond the lower division, an aim we certainly endorse.

We believe such a hire would benefit the campus, and that the suggestion is in keeping with the expanded role the Writing Program could helpfully take vis-à-vis writing pedagogy on the campus as a whole. However, we believe that dedicating a Writing Program recruitment to a campus WAC Coordinator at this point would put the cart before the horse. The Writing Program now has a curriculum devoted during the regular academic year almost exclusively to the lower-division writing GEs; it currently has no official relationship with the writing-intensive requirement. (In a separate administrative role, the chair of the Writing Program consults with the Committee on Educational Policy about W course proposals, but this responsibility is not part of the Writing Program’s regular business.) While we would support a Senate-level position for a WAC Coordinator, and would welcome such a role for a Writing Program faculty member, before dedicating one of our open lines, or even an additional line, to such a position, we would expect the campus first to solidify an appropriate infrastructure for the W requirement (a project we know CEP is currently engaged in) and next to establish a defined role for the Writing Program vis-à-vis that requirement.

(4) The ERC report calls for consultation with national experts on several subjects: on hiring ladder vs. Lecturer SOE faculty for open Senate-level positions (3); on determining the best methods for assessing program efficacy (4, 5); and on determining the best methods for assessing students’ abilities to advance from ELWR-unsatisfied to ELWR-satisfied classes (6, 7). In response to the first recommendation, Dean Van Den Abbeele has already convened a task force of Senate faculty (two Writing Program LSOEs and one ladder faculty member apiece from Linguistics and Literature) charged with investigating Writing Program hiring practices at other UC campuses. This committee will report directly to the dean—the report is due at the end of October—and the dean will then decide. This process should be helpful in articulating the course the Writing Program takes for future hiring.

On the other two recommendations, we respectfully disagree with the need to bring in national experts. We are interested and ready to participate in wider scholarly discussion on best practices in assessment. In fact we have already done so. That said, the Writing Program’s assessment practices are well in keeping with national recommendations on the subject; indeed, the ERC report acknowledges that our portfolio system for ELWR placement meets national expectations (6). Also, though we do indeed employ the
Analytical Writing Placement Exam again at the end of the fall quarter, we do so not as an exit exam but as a placement exam. It is separate from the work students do in their classes and does not affect the course outcomes, a benefit to our students and to campus retention of at-risk students.\(^1\) Retaking the test is integral to the way that we manage the ELWR at UCSC; indeed, this practice has been singled out for praise by prior review committees for its efficiency and effectiveness.

We also demur on the subject of consulting with national experts on program assessment, a recommendation that the ERC report makes without explaining (4). In preparing our program-wide Writing 1/2 assessment project, for instance, a committee of Writing Program faculty led by our most senior members spent several years researching, planning, piloting, and fine-tuning an assessment protocol—a protocol that received the approval of a recognized national expert on the subject (Leslie Perelman, MIT) when faculty members presented the approach at a national conference. We are confident that our protocol is sound. We have already found it to be an effective and productive tool for self-study. Indeed it has already yielded data that we have used to update our teaching materials and improve the consistency of our teaching.

**Conclusion**
The Writing Program has found the review process illuminating and helpful, as much for the opportunity to examine our own recent history and practices as for the chance to confer intently with practicing professionals from other campuses about what we do and what we could, or possibly should, do. The review has inspired quite a few valuable conversations among ourselves and with our colleagues both on and off campus. We look forward to the next stages of the discussion.

\(^1\) Our practice differs from that of UC campuses that do not make this distinction between course and ELWR outcomes. As a result, UCSC students, especially those who are English language learners, progress in good standing toward their degrees and on developing their writing skills rather than repeatedly failing courses, and jeopardizing both their academic standing and their retention, because of their need for extended instruction in Entry Level Writing.
November 7, 2007

ALISON GALLOWAY
VICE PROVOST ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

RE: Writing Program External Review Response

Dear Alison,

I am pleased to present the Writing Program’s response to their recent external review. In general, I am pleased with the review, which struck me as forthright and constructive in its evaluations, queries and suggestions. I do note that, while a number of highly specific recommendations are made by the reviewers, many of the larger questions that affect the future development of the program are largely tabled, or recommended for “further discussions.” The first sentence of the second paragraph on p. 2 is emblematic: “What we recommend, therefore, is a series of discussions involving the Writing Program, the administration, and faculty from other writing programs to help shape a plan for the future of the UCSC Writing Program.” I will return to this general “recommendation” after addressing some of the more particular issues raised in the report.

In terms of the specific recommendations, as the Writing Program response details, many of them have already been addressed. I have convened a small committee to explore the advantages and disadvantages of hiring ladder faculty to fill vacated LSOE positions. I am hopeful to get a response in the next several days that will allow me to make a decision on this potential change. But again, the review report does not specifically recommend an outcome, merely that this possibility be explored, citing as they do the contradictory evidence. on the one hand, that LSOE positions are not understood outside the UC system and fail to garner applications from top candidates, thus leading to failed searches (as happened just last year in the search for an LSOE to coordinate ELWR instruction); and on the other, that LSOEs are better suited to maintaining “the collegiality and collaboration” of the program’s existing instructional corps.

Other recommendations that are already being implemented include the hiring of a second full-time staff person (search currently in progress); the hiring of an NSF TESOL specialist (done); funding for tutorial assistance to help students satisfy the ELWR requirement (restored under an agreement with VP/DUE’s office); “regularization” of College Writing Coordinators as members of the Writing program faculty; and progress towards an MOU to stabilize the program budget. A set of recommendations addresses the need to establish better coordination between college core courses and writing courses. The WP appears in general agreement with these recommendations, but the College Provosts will have to be part of this discussion as well.

The reviewers expressed some confusion about the current campus designation of courses that fulfill the ELWR requirement, viz. C1 and C2, Writing 1 and Writing 2. I will admit to having had to take quite some time myself when I came here to understand this terminology, though I will take some comfort in the WP’s claim that “the nomenclature problem is self-correcting,” that they have “not noticed any noteworthy confusion among students,” and that the Writing 1
course name will in any event soon be “retired” with the impending graduation of those students who came in under the old requirement.

The reviewers also recommend the hiring of a “senior Senate faculty member” to serve as administrative coordinator for the “W” requirement with the aim of converting the W offerings into “a true WAC [Writing Across the Curriculum] program rather than a collection of courses.” In my view, such a recommendation must first await the current CEP-driven reconsideration of ways to deliver the W requirement. There also appears no specific reason or justification for that person being a member of the Writing Program faculty per se. On the other hand, the reviewers’ weighing in on this campus discussion also speaks to an implicit, if undeveloped, concern with the scope of the Writing Program and, in particular, with its involvement in writing instruction beyond the lower-division level.

Such an expansion of the WP is, of course, wholly contingent on the availability of greater resources. The current MOU discussions between the offices of the CP/EVC and the Dean of Humanities seek to provide a stable funding envelope to assure the program’s current primary mission of delivering ELWR instruction. While the MOU will not preclude further growth and program expansion, its function is more directly concerned with precluding any further erosion. Specifically, the MOU is limited to clarifying funding and resource allocations insofar as they support the scope and nature of the Writing Program’s curriculum for the satisfaction of the ELWR (a UC requirement) and UCSC campus writing requirements. Although the MOU will be an agreement between the Division and central administration, it does not presume that increased costs associated with university and campus writing requirements will be entirely covered by the center. Nor does the MOU presume to address the administrative organization of the program, its constitution of faculty, the appropriate use of GSIs, or other curricular issues such as the establishment of minors, majors, and the like. These later questions are in fact to be reserved to the Division under the terms foreseen in the MOU and thus contingent upon future divisional resources and planning.

And perhaps this is where we are returned to the larger questions about the WP’s scope and role on the UCSC campus, questions which remain largely unanswered by the reviewers and for which they recommend further “consultation with national experts.” For example, on p. 2, we read: “the Writing Program should be involved in a planning process that would involve discussions with the administration and with national composition experts in order to determine what the best direction is for the Writing Program, given the distinct mission of UCSC.” The WP’s response to such suggestions strikes me as unduly defensive, dismissing such consultations with national experts (on assessing student progress, on program effectiveness, on the relative merits of ladder faculty vs. LSOEs, etc.) as unnecessary. If the reviewers’ recommendations to consult national experts on a variety of big program issues mean a passive acceptance of outside advice, then the WP’s response would be justified. On the other hand, the reviewers seem to be suggesting something else (after all, they are already “national experts” on the issues they cite), namely an ongoing set of dialogues internal to the campus but also making judicious use of external campus resources that puts the mission and scope of the Writing Program at the center of campus-wide concerns with our much vaunted “uncommon commitment to undergraduate education.” Indeed, if the WP wants to participate more broadly in the delivery of writing instruction at all levels of the curriculum, then the establishment of such an ongoing forum of discussion would seem to be a strong prerequisite. Indeed, one could imagine such a set of conversations, visits, conferences, seminars and the like as modeling best practices and inventing
new ways of addressing old problems on a scale as to put our efforts here at UCSC in the very forefront of national discussions around issues of writing and general education. One could well imagine white papers, teaching manuals, textbooks and even instructional videos as potential outcomes. In this way, what at first blush might appear to be a reluctance by the reviewers to make pronouncements on the bigger issues affecting the WP, in point of fact turns out to be the very mechanism by which to reassert and reinforce the centrality of the WP's concerns.

My hope, then, is that this external review process, rather than being brought to speedy and inconsequential closure, should be the beginning of a fully vetted campus conversation on the many issues surrounding that most basic of basic skills.

Yours,

[Signature]

Georges Van Den Abbeeze
Dean, Humanities Division

cc. VPAA Galloway
    VPDUE Ladusaw
    Assistant Dean Caloss
    Principal Analyst Moses
    Analyst Ray
    Academic Senate
RE: Writing Program External Review

January 18, 2008

VPAA Alison Galloway
Chancellor’s Office

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) has reviewed all the materials submitted to date for the 2006-07 External Review of the Writing Program. The report of the External Review Committee (ERC) praises the high quality of the writing faculty and of the instruction as delivered, but the overall assessment characterizes the program as one at risk from budget-driven cuts. The ERC concludes that both the pedagogical scope of the program, now narrowed to a focus on entry-level instruction rather than the broad ranging approach of writing-across-the-disciplines, and the consequent “underutilization” of the academic staff threaten the overall health of a program that was just a short time ago regarded as “the most distinctive and outstanding program in the UC system” (1999 External Review Report). This is especially critical given the current campus focus on reforming and strengthening the “W” requirement.

The CPB perspective focuses on the status of the Writing Program in relation to the delivery of “W” courses and the coordination of the freshman composition courses across the ten colleges. We conclude that the current situation of a reduced academic mission for the program is attributable to budgetary rather than pedagogical reasons. During the round of budget cuts in the late 90s, for example, funding was cut for the campus coordinator of writing-across-the-disciplines, one of the more successful initiatives within the Writing Program. Subsequent budget decisions made by the dean in the early 2003 eliminated upper-division curriculum such as the Journalism minor. Compounding the erosion of these cuts, now that freshman enrollments have grown, it is not clear that resources have kept pace. The ERC Report notes that both the demand for and nature of the courses have changed, as students require more remedial instruction at the entry level. The result appears to be a sweeping unintended negative consequence of “gutting” (the word used in the ERC Report) the program in delivering and coordinating the “W” requirement as well as the upper-division curriculum.

- CPB urges that the cuts to the budget be restored, within an ongoing budgetary analysis of the needs of fulfilling the newly invigorated “W” requirement.

CPB echoes the conclusion of the ERC Report that the problems with the Writing Program are organizational and budgetary rather than intellectual and pedagogical. The key questions about program administration, leadership and future hiring (tenure-track versus Lecturer SOE) that are raised in the Report would also be best approached from this perspective.
• The Report advises, and CPB concurs, that the future direction of faculty hiring for the program be formally explored by members of the campus community with participation by an outside expert, as has been done successfully at other UC campuses.

• We recommend that the administration accelerate discussions, initiated by the MOU and Senate reform of the “W” requirement, of the best campus venue for the Writing Program.

Among the solutions proposed, the one that has been most frequently put forward is the possibility of moving Writing out of the Humanities Division and placing it under central leadership, perhaps of the VPDUE (who is currently negotiating the MOU with the Humanities Dean). We endorse taking further steps in this process, assessing the budgetary implications of the loss of FTE and enrollments to the Humanities Division as well as the benefits to the campus as a whole.

The excellence of the Writing Program and its incontrovertible contributions to the quality of undergraduate education at UCSC require that the campus provide the necessary support to maintain its health. That the costs here are both essential and relatively modest make their restoration all the more imperative.

Susan Gillman, Chair

Committee on Planning and Budget

CC: Dean Van Den Abbeele
Chair Abrams
Analyst Moses
Committee on Educational Policy
Graduate Council
January 24, 2008

Alison Galloway  
Vice Provost for Academic Affairs  

Re: CEP’s Response to the Writing Program External Review  

Dear VPAA Galloway:  

CEP is pleased to see that once again an external review committee (ERC) gives high praise to our Writing Program faculty. The latest ERC is “greatly impressed with their professionalism, their collegiality, and the collaborative way they work, especially with regard to establishing outcomes for their curricula and establishing agreed-upon standards for student work.” They are described as “active public intellectuals”, deeply engaged and reflective in their approach to their mission.  

At the same time, the fundamental message of the review is that our Writing Program faculty “are a seriously underutilized resource for the campus.” The ERC writes  

The Writing Program has gone from a fullservice one (providing courses at both the entry-level and upper division and consulting with faculty across the disciplines to develop “W” classes) to a program that focuses on entry-level instruction, a change that has reduced the Program to a model that was out of date 25 years ago.  

We take it to be understood that this curtailment of the Writing Program was never the desire of its faculty but was imposed by a series of decisions on the part of the campus administration.  

Some of the ERC’s recommendations have been or are being addressed in some way. For example, administrative staff have been hired; there is more funding for writing tutors; the Dean of Humanities has been engaging faculty on the question of the future direction of Writing Program hires; and the Memorandum of Understanding to stabilize funding continues to be negotiated.  

In this response we focus on four issues: 1) the Memorandum of Understanding; 2) writing in the disciplines; 3) writing and the college core courses; and 4) the future of WP hires.  

The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)  

We understand the goals of the MOU to be i) stabilize funding of freshman writing courses in a way that is tied to campus enrollment; ii) broaden the use of graduate student instructors in freshman writing; iii) free up funding for Writing Program faculty to reinvigorate curricular offerings beyond freshman writing.  

We take the desirability of (i) to be self-evident. As for (ii), the obvious concerns have to do with maintaining consistent high quality instruction and reliably obtaining and retaining graduate student instructors. The Writing Program knows how to train graduate students; the question is how to attract and hold onto (for a while) excellent candidate GSIs. This probably cannot happen without the active support of Humanities departments with graduate programs, and these programs will naturally have their own curricular interests most at heart. We wonder whether Dean Van Den Abbeele can find concrete ways to encourage departments to send graduate students to the Writing Program in a regular way. One idea is to establish some kind of certificate program in writing instruction; graduate students who completed the
training and taught some number of writing courses would receive the certificate. It is clear that the Writing Program and the task force mentioned in footnote 1 take (iii) to be a crucial goal of the MOU negotiations. We find the Dean’s comments in this regard to be much less encouraging: “While the MOU will not preclude further growth and program expansion, its function is more directly concerned with precluding any further erosion.” We would like clarification of this issue at the closure meeting. In particular, CEP strongly supports a funding arrangement that is consistent with the Writing Program faculty’s target full time workload goal of 6 courses and two equivalencies per year. We see this as a fundamental prerequisite to a certain amount of Writing Program growth and reinvention that is in fact desperately needed by this campus; see for instance the following section.

Writing in the disciplines

Some time this year CEP and CPB will jointly submit a proposal calling for the establishment of a Writing in the Disciplines requirement. (CEP is currently working with individual departments.) We envision a change in regulations that would make it a responsibility of departments to articulate their discipline-specific communication objectives for their majors and to see that these objectives are met. Such a change will be possible only given new funding commitments on the part of the administration. The proposal is likely to call for some or all of the following.

- Support for TAs and other instructors.
- Re-establishment of a peer tutoring program for Writing in the Disciplines.
- Increased and active involvement of Writing Program faculty in Writing in the Disciplines, through consultations with faculty and teaching assistants, TA training, training of peer tutors, etc.
- Dedication of some or all of a Senate-level FTE to Writing in the Disciplines.

Regarding the last item, both the Writing Program and the Dean of Humanities observe that dedicating a position to Writing in the Disciplines before the Senate has established a basis and a culture for it would be “putting the cart before the horse”. We see the point, but it is equally true that persuading your faculty to build a big cart is hard to do without their knowing there will be a horse (so to speak) to pull it. Perhaps the biggest obstacle to progress is the faculty’s sense that they will have a burden imposed on them with no support; in such a context, a commitment on the part of the administration, even if contingent on things like changes in regulation, could be a big help.

Writing and the college core courses

In spite of progress made with the move to C1 and C2, integration of writing and core has some way to go. Everyone seems to agree that 10 weeks is too little time to meet objectives in both writing and the substance of college core curricula. This fact, combined with the yearly struggle to find qualified instructors and the bewildering way that responsibility for staffing courses is divided up between the Writing Program and the colleges, virtually guarantees that there will be issues of quality and consistency in meeting educational objectives especially in core courses.

In addition we understand that the college Provosts may be coming to their own conclusion that the current arrangements for meeting the different needs of non-ELWR satisfied, ELWR satisfied, and C2-ready students is no longer functioning well.

---

1 This was an idea entertained by the Humanities Division Task Force on the Utilization of Graduate Instructors in the Language and Writing Programs.
Meanwhile, CEP has been entertaining ways in which general education reform could interact with the college curricula.

We think the Writing Program is right that it is time to form a committee drawing on Provosts and members of the Writing Program and CEP to re-examine the C1/C2 curricula and how it is delivered.

*The future of Writing Program hires*

Dean Van Den Abbeele has been actively exploring the question whether future Senate-level hires in the Writing Program should be Lecturers with Security of Employment, following past practice, or ladder-rank faculty. CEP has little it can add to the report of the recent task force on this issue. However, CEP members expressed the opinion that if ladder-rank faculty are brought in this be done with great attention to the factors, such as a focus on research and effects on faculty authority and morale, that could every easily distract the Writing Program from its teaching mission.

The ERC expresses the worry that in a “seller’s market” it would be hard to attract excellent candidates to an LSOE position, because such a position is easily mistaken for a temporary one. We wonder whether this problem can’t be mitigated by means of a well-worded job description.

To conclude, CEP strongly agrees with Dean Van Den Abbeele that this review process should lead to continued serious discussion of these and related issues, and one hopes, to a positive resolution of many of them.

Sincerely,

/s/

Jaye Padgett, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy

cc: Dean Van Den Abbeelee
    Dept Chair Abrams
    CPB Chair Gillman
    GC Chair Miller
    Principal Analyst Moses
January 29, 2008

TO:  VPAA Alison Galloway
FROM:  Tyrus Miller, GC Chair

RE:  Graduate Council Response on the Writing Program External Review

Dear Alison,

Graduate Council has reviewed the External Review Committee report and the responses of the Writing Program, Humanities Dean Van Den Abbeele, and CPB. Although graduate affairs are a relatively limited part of the Writing Program’s overall purview and, accordingly, only marginally touched upon in the review process, there are a few points on which we would like to comment.

First, we were disappointed that, for reasons unstated, the program did not succeed in having the ERC committee meet with graduate student instructors teaching for the program. This would have been an important source of information about the experience of graduate students as writing teachers and would have provided feedback about the effectiveness of the training/mentoring, relations between graduate student and lecturer instructors in writing, and workload for graduate teachers. Nor was the issue of graduate student instructor experience given more than cursory treatment in the Program’s self-study. We are thus requesting that the Writing Program (WP) solicit graduate student feedback and provide this information to Graduate Council. We are especially interested to know:

- Graduate students’ views of the effectiveness and usefulness of the pedagogical preparation in Writing 203.
- Graduate students’ views of the overall effectiveness and time commitment associated with training and mentorship of graduate writing instructors.
- Graduate views of workload as writing instructors, including the required mentorship of first and second-time instructors.

Second, although it was not mentioned in the responses of the WP, the Dean, or CPB, we understand that the issues raised in the self-study and its workload appendix about the funding of graduate instructors have been resolved by the establishment of Writing-specific supplementary GSIs allocated by the Humanities Division for WP graduate-led sections. It is our understanding that these GSIs are supplementary to the WP’s open allocation and that their availability to Writing (and Languages) does not affect the total available TA allocation for other academic units in Humanities.
This issue of the system of funding graduate instructors out of the open allocation to the Program was raised in the context of the MOU proposal to create equivalencies for lecturers out of funds that would otherwise have been used to pay 15 graduate instructors. It is the understanding of Graduate Council that the graduate instructors now no longer represent a debit against the Program’s open allocation for instruction, nor, since the funds are specifically designated for graduates, can the GSIs be “reallocated” as proposed. We would be interested in the closure meeting to hear this issue explicitly addressed and whether our interpretation of these developments in the funding of graduate instruction is correct.

Finally, we wish to underscore the positive role that the Writing Program plays—and could play in the future—in training and mentoring graduate students, both as WP instructors and as TAs/GSIs in the disciplines. Graduate Council welcomes suggestions on ways in which the WP’s role in providing graduate students with pedagogically and professionally useful training in writing-based instruction could be strengthened.

cc: CPB Chair
    CEP Chair
    Humanities Dean Van Den Abbeele
    Writing Program Chair Abrams
    Graduate Dean Sloan