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I. INTRODUCTION
The UCSC Writing Program’s last Self-Study (1998-99) opened with a reference to the Program’s then-current “struggle, in the face of deep budget cuts, to retain the excellence and essential qualities and values that gave the Program its identity,” and its “almost simultaneous struggle to rebuild with sufficient ingenuity and intelligence so as to create an even stronger program.” This effort gave rise to a central funding agreement, a stabilized Journalism minor, a Writing Across the Curriculum effort poised to expand, and a new minor in Communication and Rhetoric. Eight years later, nearly the same words might be used to describe the journey the Writing Program has since undergone after an even more devastating series of budget cuts and retrenchments—including the near-total loss of all the programs noted above (most of which had survived, though in diminished form, through the first series of budget cuts) and further losses to our long-standing involvement in outreach efforts and writing tutoring. To our considerable satisfaction, the Program’s outlook has again begun to look promising. Although we are now closer to the beginning of rebuilding the Program than we were during our last external review in 1999, we have, even in the most challenging moments, continued to nurture and build on the Program’s essential excellence. Today the Program stands on the cusp of another funding agreement brokered by Division and central administration, one that will, to a great degree, determine the shape of the Writing Program’s future. Though this agreement is still in development and thus tentative, its outlines are sufficiently hopeful to imagine a Program once again truly serving the needs of the campus, and drawing on the projects the Program has begun to imagine and implement using the resources we have at hand.

***

The UCSC Writing Program is an independent unit located within the Division of Humanities. Since the last Self-Study, the Program’s main responsibilities to incoming freshmen and to its own faculty have remained largely unchanged. We echo them here:

1 Certain essentials concerning the Program—e.g., its pedagogical responsibilities toward incoming freshmen—have remained essentially unchanged since the last Self-Study. On occasion, this document quietly includes language from the previous Self-Study that still applies today. In addition, in the last two years, the Program has submitted a major planning document and a proposal that would substantially affect workload, and members have collaborated on a third curricular proposal. Together, these documents substantially rehearse many of the ideas presented here. They are the Writing Program Academic Plan (Dec. 2005), the Writing Program Workload Proposal (June 2005), and the Committee on Preparatory Education’s (CPE) Proposal for Increased Curricular Support for Students Under-Prepared for University-Level Writing (May 2006), included as Appendices A, B, and C and recommended alongside this document.
to provide effective, innovative, intellectually challenging instruction for students who come to UCSC without having satisfied the University of California’s Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR), with special attention to the needs of traditionally underrepresented students and those who are English language learners (e.g., immigrants and bilingual children of immigrants who are struggling with the conventions of standard academic English), and thus to assist these students in satisfying the new “C1” campus composition requirement;

(2) to offer an outstanding freshman composition course—now in transition from Writing 1, Composition and Rhetoric, to Writing 2, Rhetoric and Inquiry—designed to stand at the theoretical and practical center of first-year students’ general education, with a sufficient number of sections so that all entering students can satisfy the campus composition requirements during their first two years at UCSC (that is, the C requirement for those who entered UCSC prior to fall 2005; the C1 and C2 requirements for those who entered afterward);

(3) to provide mentoring and instruction in the theory and practice of teaching composition to graduate students who wish to become expert teachers of writing;

(4) to provide mentoring and instruction in the theory and practice of tutoring writing to outstanding undergraduate students who wish to serve as writing assistants to students held for the ELWR;

(5) to provide to UCSC the resource of an outstanding professional writing faculty and to provide to members of that faculty the collegiality, security, remuneration, personal satisfaction, and opportunity for professional development that will enable them to pursue their goals as teachers, researchers, writers, and concerned, knowledgeable, integrated members of this academic community.

These are meaningful responsibilities, and have for many years been at the heart of our mission. In teaching students to write purposefully and effectively in a range of rhetorical situations, the Writing Program provides perhaps the essential element in preparing undergraduates for success within and beyond the academy. In serving as professional, engaged colleagues to faculty across the campus, Writing Program faculty demonstrate their stake in the success of UCSC itself. And in providing its own faculty with avenues for professional and personal fulfillment, the Program aims to remain the best version of itself, for students, faculty, and campus as a whole.

Meeting these responsibilities has been challenging under the most recent funding policy governing the Program, but we have, we believe, largely succeeded in doing so.

In the period since the last external review, other responsibilities to which the Program has historically been equally dedicated have been curtailed or eliminated—the result of significant funding cuts and restrictions on Program faculty’s license to work with other units. The Program no longer offers any upper-division or graduate courses beyond those specifically designed to benefit freshmen; its two minors, in Journalism and
Communication and Rhetoric, are suspended; its efforts to improve writing pedagogy in the disciplines have largely ended, as have its outreach efforts via the Central California Writing Project and other educational partnerships. These changes have radically reshaped the Writing Program and transformed it from a full-service program with opportunities for writers at every stage of their development to a writing program focused on moving first-year students through the lower-division campus composition requirements.

In the external review of 1998-99, reviewers David Bartholomae, Sheridan Blau, and Linda Brodkey highlighted the excellence of the Program, noting that “As a provider of intellectually rigorous and serious undergraduate writing instruction, it ranks with the very best Writing Programs in the country,” and calling it “the most distinctive and outstanding program in the UC system.” They continue, however, with a caution: “The Program’s continued health and vitality should be of utmost concern” to the senior administration.

Though our teaching and service to the campus have remained verifiably outstanding, with the losses to our program we can no longer claim to be the “most distinctive and outstanding program in the UC system.” The changes to the curriculum and to on- and off-campus outreach efforts have been costly to the Program—to faculty morale and opportunity for professional development—and also to the campus as a whole: to students, who have fewer opportunities to develop as writers; and to campus faculty, who have been seeing the effects of a diminished Writing Program and are also facing a near-crisis in the number of writing-intensive (W) courses at the same moment as the Writing Program has lost its funding to offer or, in most cases, support such classes.

Despite these losses, there is much to celebrate, and rich ground on which to rebuild. The Program has retained its greatest resource—its superb, creative, and dedicated faculty—and has continued to develop innovative and useful ways of improving writing instruction at UCSC and the Program as a whole. During our recent period of retrenchment, members of the Program developed an effective, efficient, and cheap method of assessing its Writing 1/2 classes that also serves as a form of faculty development; partnered with the college provosts, the VP/DUE, and others in inventing the campus’s new two-part composition requirement (C1/C2), and received a significant campus grant to develop materials to pave the transition from old to new requirement; proposed and started to implement changes to the ELWR curriculum that will improve the success of underrepresented minorities, English language learners, and other at-risk writers while contributing to campus goals of retention and diversity; served as members of Academic Senate standing committees and special committees (and substantially drafted several major and minor reports from those committees); launched a regular reading and discussion group on democracy and education; researched and reported on the role of writing in the education of science students; and begun substantive planning and drafting of a book of essays representing the thinking and practices of faculty in the Program. We have announced our first distinguished author lecture in non-fiction writing with an appearance by Jonathan Franzen in January, and have planned to award our first student prize in published non-fiction writing at about the same time. We have successfully
petitioned for the recruitment of a Lecturer SOE to serve as campus ELWR coordinator, a position we expect to fill this year. And with the cooperation and assistance of VP/DUE William Ladusaw, we have produced a workload proposal that, if adopted, shows great promise of reenlivening the Writing Program’s ability to serve the campus as a whole while resolving, after many years, a workload dilemma that effectively kept most Program faculty from full-time employment.

The Writing Program has a history of doing much with relatively few resources. With the advent of a welcome change to its funding policy, it is poised once again to place its considerable intellectual resources at the service of the campus. This document examines the Program’s achievements and projects in the context of challenges and opportunities that have arisen since our last external review.

II. CONTEXT
In the eight years since the Program’s last external review, UCSC has had four chancellors, four executive vice-chancellors, and four deans in the Humanities Division, and the Writing Program has been governed by two relatively short-lived funding policies, the last of which is now giving way to a third. If we extend the period to the last ten years, we can count four funding policies including the one now being crafted. In the same period, the approaches of the Division and central administration to the place of writing instruction at UCSC have varied across extremes. In 1998, the campus Millennium Committee report devoted significant space to discussing writing instruction and administration, noting areas of interest or concern for the campus at large, and making recommendations for positive change. Many of these recommendations were implemented in the subsequent two or three years (e.g., improving access to writing tutors and to writing-intensive courses, directing the EVC to “complete the process of creating funding for a stand-alone writing program”), only to be dismantled or radically altered in the several years immediately afterward. In 2001, the Humanities Division’s Ten-Year Academic Plan recommended the conversion of the stand-alone Writing Program into a Department of Rhetoric and Communication, using the Journalism and newly created Communication and Rhetoric minors as the foundation for several proposed tracks in the major. In 2002, under the same dean, the Division reversed itself, cut all permanent sources of funding for the minors, and reduced the Writing Program to a first-year program. Though curricular issues are under faculty purview, the latter changes were initiated and conducted administratively, with Academic Senate review taking place, if at all, only after the fact. The Program’s accomplishments in this period must be read against these rapidly shifting policies, priorities, and funding models.

---

3 See http://planning.ucsc.edu/plans2001/. For the current draft Humanities Academic Plan (2006), which offers a limited vision of the role of the Writing Program (and is currently under revision by a new dean), see http://humwww.ucsc.edu/administration/deans_office/.
4 In an effort to retain faculty control over curricular issues, the Academic Senate Committee on Educational Policy has twice (in 2004 and 2006) refused the requests of Humanities deans to expunge the minors from the course catalogue.
Tracking the course of the Writing Program since the last external review requires at least an outline of Program’s recent and current contexts. The following snapshot shows the Writing Program’s remaining campus curricular responsibilities, and is followed by explanations of several rings of circumstances that have affected the Writing Program’s curricular offerings, funding, workload statistics, and role on campus since the last of the major upheavals described above. This section ends with a sketch of the funding Memorandum of Understanding now under construction, as the Writing Program understands it.

**Curricular responsibilities:** Like all UC campuses, UCSC is responsible for helping students satisfy the post-admission Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR). It also has a two-part lower-division campus composition requirement (Composition 1 and 2, or C1/C2), and a writing-intensive requirement (W) that students satisfy by taking a designated course in the disciplines. In cooperation with the colleges, the Writing Program is responsible for the majority of the lower-division writing curriculum.

In addition to courses designed for lower-division students seeking to satisfy UC and UCSC requirements, the Writing Program now offers just three upper-division and graduate-level courses, each of which supports the lower-division writing curriculum: a grammar course for tutors and aspiring teachers, a theory and practice course for writing tutors, and a theory and practice course for graduate students interested in teaching writing. The two or three upper-division W courses the Writing Program offers each year in summer school are the Program’s only remaining contributions to the campus W requirement.

**Commensurable Funding Policy:** In 2002, the funding agreement struck by Dean Jorge Hankamer, EVC Michael Tanner, and Chair Carol Freeman, and referred to hopefully in the last external review, expired, and with it ended centrally supervised funding for the freshman writing program, known then as the Campus Writing Program. With the end of the Tanner agreement and the introduction of subsequent EVC John Simpson’s decentralized funding model for the Divisions, the Humanities Division assumed sole responsibility for both the Campus Writing Program and the upper-division program known as the Humanities Writing Program, including the Program’s two minors. Dean Wlad Godzich responded by defunding the upper-division and introducing the two-pronged “Commensurable Funding Policy,” which (1) limited Writing Program funding to 12 FTE ($620,400) of Temporary Academic Staffing (TAS) funds without provision for fluctuations in enrollment or number of students held for ELWR; these FTE were to cover all courses taught by Non Senate Faculty (NSF) and graduate students as well as the remaining fractional course equivalencies (usually one-sixth of a lecturer’s per-course salary) that compensate NSF for services to the Writing Program; and (2) imposed limitations on course buyouts so costly that, with few exceptions, Writing Program faculty (Lecturers SOE especially, but also continuing NSF) were effectively prevented from teaching or serving in other campus units. With the exception of a very few campus service, voluntary, or grant-funded efforts, this policy thus effectively ended the Writing Program’s long record of innovative collaboration with faculty across the campus.
The funding limits introduced by the Commensurable Funding Policy also spelled the loss of the Writing Program’s writing-intensive (W) courses, except the two or three offered during the summer session; the demise of campus-funded universal writing tutoring for students in ELWR-related classes; the introduction of a fee-for-service tutoring model that has, predictably, reduced the number of students benefiting from the service and burdened those for whom even a $69 fee is prohibitive; and the increase in class size in composition courses to 25 from the limit of 22 negotiated in the Tanner agreement. (Before 2001, class sizes were held to 20.)

**Unfunded merit increases:** The introduction of the Commensurable Funding Policy had a major, unintended funding consequence for Program and Division. The Program’s budget allocation did not account for lecturers’ merit increases. Merit increases for lecturers have gone unfunded by the state legislature, and at UCSC—uniquely among the UC campuses—the costs have been passed on to the Division (the Humanities Division houses the largest population of NSF on campus), and from the Division to the Program. These pressures simultaneously squeezed the Program’s fixed budget, and ensured an annual request for additional funds from the Division to cover the remaining cost of courses we were obligated to offer and salaries we were contractually bound to meet. For its part, the Division found itself paying about $30,000 to $35,000 annually to cover NSF merit increases, money that comes out of TAS funds that also bankroll hiring upgrades and other discretionary costs within the Division. (The Program’s faculty, almost all of whom have continuing contracts and all of whom teach required courses, are paid out of the same pool of “temporary” staffing funds.\(^5\))

**Payroll and workload statistics:** Actual faculty workload, as we discuss in section III below (Academic Staff), has increased in the years since the last external review: faculty are teaching more classes with more students in them and doing more work for the same small equivalencies. Statistics provided by the Office of Planning & Budget, however, suggest that workload has decreased. Despite increases in size of classes, student population, and the freshman class, a regular faculty of 20 (the same size as in 1998-99), and a modest increase in undergraduate student workload FTE from 295 in 1998-99 to 314 in 2004-05, in the two years between 2002-03 and 2004-05, this measure dropped 25%, from 419 to 314. In the same period, the workload ratio of student FTE to budgeted faculty FTE decreased from 25.1 in to 15.1. (The drop is gentler from 1998-99, at 20.1, to 2004-05, at 15.1.) Three key elements, by-products of the Writing Program’s history and its large cohort of Non-Senate Faculty, intersect to create this effect:

1. **Student workload FTE and the minors:** In 2001-02, the Humanities Division announced the suspension of the minors, with a shut-down period of three years.

---

\(^5\) See Item #1 in Chair Roz Spafford’s follow-up report to Dean Wlad Godzich on the last external review, Appendix D. In it she succinctly addresses the problem of funding permanent courses out of temporary, and fungible, funds. Dean Georges Van Den Abbeele has indicated that he intends to reclassify and fence off the funding for the Writing and Languages Programs.
Students who had already declared minors immediately flocked to the Program to take the classes they needed to graduate with the minor, increasing workload statistics for a brief time and then depressing them. Though Journalism classes were explicitly writing classes and the minor itself was deliberately kept small, Communication and Rhetoric classes were designed, for the most part, to accommodate larger numbers of students. (Indeed, one of the rationales for starting the minor was to increase enrollments and improve workload statistics in the Humanities Division, which it did.) With the loss of the minors, and especially the C & R minor, the Writing Program offered classes almost exclusively of 22 (for ELWR classes) or 25 (Writing 1/2), with only our three upper-division classes allowed to exceed that figure.  

(2) Budget FTE increases:  Budget FTE measures any salary payments the Writing Program makes. Course buyouts for Lecturers SOE are returned to the Program as Temporary Academic Staffing (TAS) funds without reducing the budgeted FTE for the permanent faculty line: the budgeted FTE thus counts the cost of the course twice. The same is true of any leaves that the Division compensates. This makes sense: faculty on leave or course relief need to be paid, and so do their replacements—but of course the classes are only taught once. Thus increases in budget FTE with no corresponding increase in student workload FTE depress workload statistics. In 2004-05, LSOEs had a total of ten course buyouts: two for medical leave, two for service on major Senate committees; three for service as provost; two for Chair’s relief; one for coordinating WID. Any courses or equivalencies that the Program pays for out of gift funds, carryforward, or other sources not part of our allocated TAS funds are also added to our TAS expenditures and increase the budget FTE. As the minors were closing down, the Writing Program paid for almost all the Journalism and Communication and Rhetoric courses out of gift funds and carryforward, as almost all of the Divisional curricular augmentations provided for that purpose went to running sufficient numbers of lower-division required classes. Finally, for several years, while the Writing Program believed it was running a serious deficit, the Division was quietly (and mistakenly, from the point of view of the Commensurable Funding Policy), returning funds to the Program to cover the cost of graduate student instruction—$50,000 or above that swelled our budget FTE and thus helped drive down our workload ratio.  

6 The college Core classes paid for by the Writing Program also tend to depress workload figures slightly. Though the Writing Program funds 24 of these classes and hence is credited for their contributions to workload, the colleges enroll them. For good pedagogical reasons some colleges manage to keep these ELWR sections of Core at 20 or below, lower than the class sizes the Writing Program can afford to maintain but in keeping with class sizes recommended both nationally and by UC’s Academic Council and systemwide Committee on Preparatory Education.  

7 From a report on the Writing Program’s budget submitted by request to the Committee on Planning and Budget (2005) in preparation for CPB’s own report (2005) on the status
(3) **Workload ratio (salary increase vs. student FTE):** When salaries increase, budget FTE increase; when budget FTE increase and student FTE decrease, the workload ratio drops. Via merit increases, NSF salaries have been increasing, but range adjustments to the value of the allocated TAS FTE meant to cover these salaries have lagged. FTE are still valued at $51,700 apiece; as individual NSF salaries start approaching that figure, the Program’s fixed TAS allocation becomes increasingly inadequate. (Discussion about the new funding MOU suggests that this problem, alongside the problem of “unfunded” merit increases, will be considered.) A further note on range adjustments: As just described, the delay in range adjustments to FTE has eroded the value of our budget allocation. At the same time, range adjustments have been applied to NSF salaries, and have affected our budget, as they are only intermittently funded by the Office of the President. If UCOP passes funds on to the campus, they can compensate departments for the cost of range adjustments. If not, the campuses absorb the cost. At UCSC, the campus has passed these costs on to the Division. While retroactive back pay resulting from the new union MOU was covered by the Division, the resulting range adjustments—beginning in October 2003—were passed directly to the Writing Program and come out of TAS. As our faculty is overwhelmingly made up of NSF paid out of TAS, range adjustments without corresponding compensation have considerable effect, both on workload ratios and on the real salary-paying power of our 12 FTE TAS budget. Considering only the then-12 continuing NSF at the appointment percentages they held with the Writing Program in 2004-05, the difference in aggregate annual salary between their old salaries and their range-adjusted salaries was $16,445, the rough

of Writing Program funding (CPB’s report is included as an appendix to Appendix A, the Program’s Academic Plan):

[A]n accounting error on the part of the Division resulted in the inadvertent erasure of the discrepancies between Divisional funding and the cost of delivering the Writing Program curriculum. Evidently the Division compensated the Writing Program for its GSI expenses. (I believe that is how funding for GSIs is handled for departments in the Division.)…[T]he Writing Program…recorded their cost against TAS in its annual curriculum plan.…

This accidental compensation has obscured the extent of the mismatch between the intended budgetary allocation and the actual costs of delivering the curriculum. According to our curriculum plans, we annually run short of resources—$60,191 in 2003-04, $13,577 in 2004-05. According to the Divisional accounting, we annually run in the black: $50,553 carried forward from 2002-03, and $65,797 (of which approximately $5000 is spoken for) carried forward from 2003-04. Without the influx of Divisional money to cover the courses represented by the graduate students, we would certainly have no carry-forward; we would also be deep in the red.
equivalent of 3 classes annually that the Program could then not afford to mount without help.

Though measuring real curricular and budgetary effects, the workload statistics are not a direct match with actual faculty workload. Writing Program faculty worked as hard as ever.

**State and local contexts:** Even as the funding for the Program became smaller and more restrictive, other campus contexts also shifted. Gradual changes to California’s demographic, combined with UCSC’s standing with potential students about midway among the UC campuses, have meant that UCSC’s incoming students are increasingly likely to be English language learners, to come from under-resourced high schools, or both—and thus increasingly likely to need more than one quarter of ELWR-related coursework. As the Writing Program offers more ELWR-related classes, its budget for other required classes grows thinner. From 2002-03 (when the Commensurable Funding Policy was activated) through the end of 2005-06, the combination of a restricted budget, unfunded merits and range adjustments, and increasing demand for classes that help students meet state- and campus-mandated requirements created a perfect storm of inadequate funding, a storm that has just begun to dissipate.

Several other campus efforts—improving retention of first-year students, improving ethnic and racial diversity, and increasing enrollment through increased numbers of transfer students—have all touched upon the Writing Program’s mission. The effort to improve UCSC’s retention and six-year graduation statistics has placed special significance on retention of first-year students: as first-year education, with its relatively small classes, is relatively expensive, improving first-year retention rates is a campus priority. The Writing Program, with its focus on first-year students, is in a good position to make a difference, especially with the students of color and English language learners who make up an increasing percentage of our ELWR-series classes. Indeed, it already has made a difference—though increasing numbers of (mostly) ELL students have arrived at their fourth quarter of enrollment without having satisfied the ELWR, and thus at risk of being barred from further enrollment, only a handful of students each year are actually barred, a result at least partly attributable to the efforts of the ELWR Coordinator and the Writing Program classes meant to serve them. At the same time, the campus expects first-year enrollments to level out at around 3000-3100 per year, with undergraduate enrollment growth projected to come mainly from larger classes of transfer students. (If growth comes, as it has before, in the first-year class, the Writing Program’s needs for first-year courses will increase.) Many transfer students come in with their composition requirements satisfied (e.g., via transferable community college courses) but with university writing skills that nevertheless do not meet the expectations of UCSC faculty. Among these transfer students are also English language learners who arrive at UCSC without significant institutional support for their writing. Anecdotal reports suggest that the Writing Program comes in for criticism, having enjoyed none of

---

8 See the CPE Proposal, pp. 1-2 (Appendix C) for a somewhat fuller account of California’s demographics and expectations for UCSC’s resulting student population.
the authority and all of the perceived responsibility for transfer students’ writing skills. But though the Program no longer has contact with such students, we have never stopped thinking about how we might reach them. The advent of a new funding MOU may provide us the opportunity for which we have been looking.

**New funding MOU:** The “Memorandum of Understanding” now being negotiated between Division and central administration aims to establish a more appropriate funding envelope for lower-division required writing courses and to rectify the problem of unfunded merit increases, in part by allowing the Writing Program the financial advantage of the TAships its enrollments annually generate. Under the Commensurable Funding Policy, the Writing Program paid the full cost of graduate student-taught courses it offered, while the other departments in the Division used the TAships the Program’s enrollments generated to support their graduate students.9 (Under the defunct Tanner Compact, half the cost of graduate student instructors’ salaries was returned to the Program to fund its upper-division courses and offer an incentive to employ graduate students.) The proposed MOU will allow the Writing Program enough TAships to cover the cost of part of its curriculum (in 2006-07, about $82,000), ensuring that in years of normal, expected enrollment the Program will have enough money budgeted to plan its curriculum in a timely manner. In combination with the sum the Program has until now used to fund its 13-14 remaining annual equivalencies, the sum previously set aside for graduate student salaries, now released, will allow the Writing Program to fund two course equivalencies for each full-time and one for each part-time NSF.10 It is with these equivalencies—the total about double what we now have available to us—that we propose to begin rebuilding writing instruction at UCSC.

Dean Jorge Hankamer’s insight, in his 1999 response to the last Writing Program external review, is worth remembering in this context. Though supporting the introduction of enrollment-based formula-funding for lower-division writing courses, he cautions that such formula-funding makes little “room for innovations and extensions (such as a renewed Writing Across the Curriculum program or a peer tutoring program)”; though “favor[ing] a re-negotiation of the funding agreement that would build in some support for these initiatives,” he felt that these were campus, not strictly Divisional, responsibilities. We find these cautions still relevant today. The Writing Program will make the best use it can of the new MOU, but will need the support of the campus as a whole to fully support writing instruction at UCSC.

---

9 The Languages Program, also held to the Commensurable Funding Policy, has historically had very few graduate student instructors. Thus this aspect of the funding policy did not significantly affect Languages. Salaries for graduate students advanced to candidacy in a number of cases significantly exceed per-course salaries for NSF who have not logged many years with the Program.

10 This equation hinges on balancing the number of graduate students and lecturers teaching in the Program. For a detailed explanation, see “Workload Calculations,” the appendix to the Workload Proposal (Appendix B).
III. ACADEMIC STAFF
The Writing Program’s faculty currently consists of

(1) Two Senior Lecturers with Security of Employment: Carol Freeman (longtime former Chair of the Program) and Don Rothman (longtime former Director of the Central California Writing Project);

(2) One Lecturer with Security of Employment: Elizabeth Abrams (current Chair of the Program);

(3) Fifteen Non Senate Faculty lecturers with continuing appointments that vary from 52% to 94% time with the Writing Program. Some have additional appointments with other campus units that increase their total percent time. Four of these NSF passed through their initial continuing review in 2005-06; others have been teaching in the Program for well over 20 years. In addition to their teaching assignments, lecturers coordinate and oversee the Entry Level Writing Requirement and the program of instruction for English language learners; serve as College Writing Coordinators at each of UCSC’s ten residential colleges (they hire, teach, and oversee undergraduate writing tutors and administer the relations among residential colleges, Learning Support Services, and Writing Program); serve on the Personnel Committee and various ad-hoc committees; and sit on several Academic Senate committees;

(4) Two pre-six lecturers hired as a result of a major search, guaranteed a minimum 50% appointment, and going through the initial continuing review in 2006-07.

The Program also maintains an active and high-quality pool of lecturers whose appointments are contingent upon availability of courses. Several of these lecturers are regular and highly valued teachers in the Program whose quarter count is edging them closer to the initial continuing review.

In 2005-06, 9 sections of Writing 1/2 (out of 86 total) were taught by graduate student Teaching Fellows or Associates (from History, Literature, History of Consciousness, Linguistics, Film and Digital Media, and Environmental Studies), and 13 sections of Writing 1/2 or college Core classes funded by the Writing Program were taught by lecturers hired from a pool. Fifteen courses were originally set aside for graduate students; pool lecturers taught courses made available by leaves, course buyouts (e.g., for Senate committee service), or sudden changes of plan by graduate students. In addition, two pool lecturers served as College Writing Coordinators (CWCs). In 2006-07, graduate students are scheduled to teach the 15 classes set aside for them, including one ELWR section of a college Core class, and pool lecturers will teach 30 sections of Writing 1/2 and Writing-funded Core courses (an effect of an enrollment spike) and will serve as CWCs in three colleges.

All Writing Program faculty members have an affiliation with one of UCSC’s ten residential colleges. Unless they are on leave in fall, all but one (ELWR Coordinator Maria Cecilia Freeman) regularly teach the fall college Core class at their colleges. At
each college but one, one faculty member serves as a College Writing Coordinator. (Oakes, whose population of students held for the ELWR is particularly large, has two CWCs.) Finally, because the Writing Program does not fund any courses at Colleges Nine and Ten, and Kresge College currently has no regular Writing Program faculty available for the position, CWCs at these colleges are currently members of the Writing Program’s lecturer pool. To ensure their familiarity with the Writing Program and enable them to be the best advisors they can be to undergraduates, the Program makes an effort to ensure that they are first in line for courses regular faculty cannot teach and that they are included in regular Program meetings and activities.

The Writing Program faculty consists of 12 women and 8 men with a range of interests and professional and personal backgrounds, including people with degrees of various ranks in philosophy, rhetoric, library science, linguistics, biology, History of Consciousness, and drama as well as literature and composition. We count in our number one translator, one “knowledge web” creator, two librettists, one former city councilman and mayor, and poets, novelists, short story writers, journalists, reviewers, essayists, textbook writers, editors, and scholars doing research in such topics as hip-hop, cultural theory, and Ezra Pound. In addition to their work in the Writing Program, faculty members have held appointments with various colleges, the departments of Literature, American Studies, Anthropology, and Theater Arts, the COSMOS summer session for high school students in the sciences, and the Division of Natural Sciences.

Retention and recruitment: The UCSC Writing Program has been most fortunate in its faculty, a group of expert, dedicated professionals deeply engaged in the work of teaching and the success of UCSC’s students and of UCSC itself. The Program’s challenge at this crossroads is to preserve the richness of its faculty at a time when both SOE and NSF lecturers are retiring, and when the curriculum has been significantly curtailed. Does the Writing Program offer enough job satisfaction to its current faculty to retain them? Are there sufficient opportunities for growth and advancement within the Program? Does the Program offer enough of interest to attract excellent potential hires from outside? These questions are now upon us: recent retirements include those of WAC and composition theory specialist Lecturer Virginia Draper (2004) and Lecturer SOE and Journalism coordinator Roz Spafford (2006), plus veteran lecturer and Dickinson scholar Ellen Hart (2006); two other key faculty members will retire at the end of 2006-07, ELWR and ELL coordinator Lecturer Maria Cecilia Freeman and Senior Lecturer SOE Don Rothman. Senior Lecturer SOE Carol Freeman, with over 30 years of service to UCSC, is also nearing retirement age. Only one current Lecturer SOE, Chair Elizabeth Abrams, has a good many years left with the Program. Future leadership is thus a central question.

That said, the Writing Program has benefited significantly since the last external review with the increase in number of Lecturers SOE from two to four. This increase provided critical administrative depth. With two new Lecturers SOE, the chairmanship could and did rotate and the Program could be and was represented by more voices in the Academic Senate. Though the Writing Program’s mission has, since these hires, shifted to focus almost exclusively on first-year writing, retaining these four faculty lines is still essential.
to the smooth running and appropriate representation of the program. In a Program largely staffed by Non Senate Faculty whose full-time workload is currently set at eight courses per year, it may be tempting to consider trading the hard FTE represented in an LSOE position (full time set at six courses and two releases for service) at retirement for more Temporary Academic Staffing (TAS) funds, which would represent more courses covered. The loss to the program and the campus, however, would be much greater than the gain in courses covered (perhaps two to four courses per year, depending on NSF salary). As Academic Senate members, LSOEs serve on campus committees critical to the mission of the program and the campus. In recent years, they have served on the Committee on Committees, and committees on Educational Policy, Planning and Budget, Teaching, and Preparatory Education; they have served as campus representatives to system-wide committees and projects; as college provosts; and on search committees for campus administrators. In such efforts, they represent the Writing Program to faculty colleagues and administrators within and beyond UCSC. Fewer than four LSOEs would trim the Writing Program’s collegial contact with the rest of the campus. Fewer than four would also mean that the chairmanship would rotate between only two faculty members (the duties of the ELWR Coordinator, soon to be a Senate-level appointment, will surely prohibit simultaneously chairing the program), and that personnel actions would regularly require outside faculty for completion. The Writing Program has had excellent success governing itself; timely recruitment of replacement LSOEs will help us continue to do so.

The Program has already taken a first, most important step in securing its future leadership: in recharacterizing the position of ELWR and ELL Coordinator as a Senate-level appointment, we are assigning appropriate stature to a position that has grown considerably in importance as a result of increased enrollment, changing demographics, and the expert leadership of M.C. Freeman. The LSOE position will guarantee full-time status to the ELWR Coordinator, build in release time for service on a variety of campus and systemwide committees as well as the administrative work of coordinating the ELWR program, and provide the Writing Program with a most valuable voice in the Academic Senate. Minimum requirements for this position include expertise in both composition and TESOL, applied linguistics, or a similar field, requirements that underscore and support the Program’s commitment to integrating English language learners into its classes and ensuring that all our classes are writing classes, while also ensuring that the population of ELL students will be appropriately served. Recruitment for this position has just opened; given the minimum requirements—essential to the demands of the position—it will likely inspire few applications from within the Program, but will, we hope, yield a number of qualified candidates from within the UC system. It is an excellent job, combining teaching and administration with an opportunity to work with students, faculty, and staff across a variety of campus and UC systemwide units. We have high hopes that both the process of recruitment, with its campus visits and faculty consultations, and the actual hiring of a new LSOE, will energize the Program and help all think of the future.

Pending approval, the Program expects to recruit for another replacement LSOE in 2007-08. With this recruitment we anticipate more applicants from within the Program as well as applicants from outside the Program. In our recent Academic Plan, we proposed
recruiting a compositionist with expertise in K-12 education. A relationship with the public schools enables Writing Program faculty to understand the context from which their students have recently emerged, a context that makes possible more focused, nuanced teaching. LSOE status will enable another faculty member with real expertise to sit on key systemwide Senate committees concerned with preparation and intersegmental cooperation. A secondary specialization in disciplinary and professional writing may be desirable especially if—as seems likely—the campus opts once again to draw more systematically on the Writing Program’s resources for assisting with upper-division writing.

We expect a third LSOE replacement recruitment will most likely take place before our next external review. The question of how we will define this position is complex and will depend in part on the fate of the Program in the wake of the new funding MOU, the result of the recruitment we hope will take place in 2007-08, and the recommendations made by the present external review team. We do believe that the new hire should have expertise in rhetoric. Beyond that, we may want to search for a coordinator of writing in the disciplines or for a coordinator of graduate student instructors or for a coordinator of writing for transfer students or graduate students. However this position is defined, the need for it is real.

One other hiring issue must be addressed in the next several years. What our last Self-Study called “the graying of the Writing Program” has continued apace and we will soon need to conduct a search for at least one more NSF with an appointment we can guarantee at 50% minimum. The Writing Program has not conducted a major search for NSF since 2001—before the current union Memorandum of Understanding was agreed upon—when we hired eight NSF and guaranteed them each a minimum of a 50% appointment, which ensures benefits. (Four of those eight just passed through the initial continuing review; one separated from UCSC almost immediately; one opted not to go through the initial continuing review; and two are undergoing the initial continuing review this year.) Because of financial instability, budget cuts, and course reductions, and also the need to maintain flexibility in the likelihood of two upcoming LSOE searches and uncertainty about the exact nature of the new funding proposal, we have not proposed appointing any new NSF to 50% minimum positions. But as a result of several recent and anticipated separations, we are now using pool lecturers to teach more courses than is good for the Program or than is consistent with our policy of making 50% appointments whenever possible. Indeed, some pool lecturers regularly have appointments of 50% or more, but have had their courses measured out in dribs and drabs over the course of a year because of funding uncertainties. Some of these lecturers have taken on considerable responsibility in the Program; some are nearing the threshold for an initial continuing review. As soon as at least the first of our LSOE recruitments is complete and the funding MOU is decided—and with it the guidelines for graduate student participation in Writing Program teaching—the Program should hire at least one, and possibly two more NSF to 50% minimum appointments.

**Workload and Morale:** Morale in the Writing Program has suffered in the wake of the many losses to the Program and the shrinking of opportunities within it. Workload
increased as variety (in courses taught and compensated co-curricular and administrative duties) decreased, changes compounded by the certainty that they were reducing the value of the education we owed our students. Though the Program never stopped the self-reflective practices that have contributed to or wholly produced such useful effects as an assessment project for Writing 1/2 classes, the new campus composition requirements (C1/C2), and the statement of expectations for C1 and C2 classes, the felt sense of retrenchment and siege have been, at times, profound. Efforts to improve the Writing Program’s effectiveness for students and to keep it interesting to faculty were productive and useful, though always hedged with reminders of what we no could no longer do. The new union MOU stabilized the positions of what are now called “continuing Non Senate Faculty”—those who have passed beyond the major review of the sixth year—by transforming triennial evaluations from reappointment to merit reviews and mandating standard minimum merit increases provided the standard of excellence is met. By contrast (and by contract), “pre-six” faculty now have a more tenuous hold on their jobs and, by fiat, no right to a formal “mid-career” review. (The Program had always previously treated mid-career reviews as an opportunity to assess and steer younger faculty as they advanced toward the sixth-year threshold.) Despite the disadvantages for the more junior faculty, however, the union MOU was mainly an additional problem, not a central problem, in the context of the other changes that have rocked the program.

Efforts by Dean Georges Van Den Abbeele and VP/DUE Ladusaw to stabilize funding for the Writing and Languages Programs offer real hope that Writing Program faculty may again imagine a more expansive (and equitable) role for themselves and their Program. The MOU the Division and the central administration hope to seal should simultaneously relieve the Division and the Program of funding the full cost of NSF merit and range increases, make the funding basis of the Program transparent and verifiable, and bring new TA resources into the Division. The vehicle for producing these effects is evidently the Writing Program’s Workload Proposal (Appendix B). The Workload Proposal aims (1) to define most NSF appointments as either full-time, at a 6 course/2 equivalency load, or part-time, at 3/1, and (2) to cover the cost of this arrangement via an allocation of TA funds to the Program: the Writing Program will continue to train, employ, and mentor graduate student instructors, but will no longer have to pay their salaries out of base funding.11 (The number of graduate students, it is assumed, will always be smaller than the number of writing professionals.) In exchange, assuming normal enrollments and a relatively stable demographic profile for the incoming class, the Writing Program agrees to manage its curriculum and assign duties to faculty without calling on the Division for additional funding.12 A windfall allocation of TA resources to

11 Employing graduate students is an opportunity we have embraced, though not without grumbling at the obligation, not expected of the Divisional departments, that we pay for them. Advanced graduate students’ per-course salaries exceed those of many of our younger faculty members.
12 Such an agreement will work only if provision for enrollment fluctuation is made. Small fluctuations make a great difference to programs that teach small classes. For every 100 additional students, the Writing Program must offer an additional four courses, hire and find offices for instructors, and so on. For every 50 additional “Admissions by
the Humanities Division in 2006 will allow the Program to keep some of the TAships its enrollments generate without reassigning them from the other departments that have come to depend upon them.

For Program faculty, the most important effects of basing the new funding MOU on our Workload Proposal are that it promises to relieve many of the effects of the now apparently defunct Commensurable Funding Policy, and that it will rectify a long-standing imbalance between workload and compensation. To begin with the latter: Few NSF in the Program are paid at 100% of their full-time equivalent salaries, but many have workloads equivalent to or exceeding full-time. (The difference between 88.75% or 91.67% and 100% is significant in the paycheck, but not in the workload.) For most of the last 30-plus years, the Program encouraged lecturers to teach no more than six courses per year, holding that teaching three 5-unit courses in one quarter was incompatible, over time, with the standards of excellence lecturers must meet. Even though financial exigencies and increasing concern about retirement benefits have caused several faculty members to teach seven or eight courses to achieve full-time or near-full-time appointments, most have opted to take a reduction in salary rather than an increase in courses. The situation has been exacerbated by the following:

- An increase in class size, in the majority of first-year writing classes, from 20 to 25, for a full-time load of 200 students rather than 160—effectively, a workload increase from eight courses to ten;
- Loss of supplemental tutoring in Writing 1/2 courses, so that faculty must, in effect, serve as their own students’ tutors;
- A severe decrease in the responsibilities specifically remunerated by course equivalencies (consulting, co-teaching, independent studies, etc.) and an increase in the work associated with remaining equivalencies.

Moving to full-time or half-time appointments will change the workloads of some regular NSF, but will improve the salary and retirement benefits of most and the job variety and satisfaction, we hope, of all.\(^\text{13}\)

Equally important, moving to this new system will enable members of the Writing Program to begin rebuilding the Program. Currently, the Writing Program assigns a bare minimum of 13-14 course equivalencies, generally fragmented into sixths of a course, to compensate faculty for the necessary administrative work they do for the Program (see the equivalency chart, Appendix E). The new system, if adopted, will slightly more than double the number of equivalencies available to the Program, equivalencies that may then

\(^{13}\) Members of the Program’s lecturer pool may be an exception. Some of them have a professional and moral claim, if not a contractual one, to membership in the regular faculty; the proposed MOU, it is hoped, will phase in gradually enough for new hires to regularize some of the pool faculty.
be used to develop, at no extra cost, services and programs for students and faculty across the campus.\textsuperscript{14} We have excellent local models in place already for such work: with a similar number of equivalencies available in the early 1990s, Writing Program faculty consulted with departmental faculty about writing in their courses, ran workshops to assist graduate students in their writing and workshops for TAs working with undergraduate writing, participated in large numbers in a variety of K-12 outreach efforts, advised and oversaw student publications, produced pedagogical materials for use by faculty and TAs in the disciplines, and more. At a recent faculty meeting, presented with the opportunity to dream the future based on such an infusion of equivalencies, Writing Program faculty suggested some of the same opportunities and some new ones as well. We offer further detail on these in the sections that follow.

The larger point, however, is this: the new funding MOU, even in its relatively preliminary state, provides considerable hope to faculty who have seen the program to which they had devoted decades of their professional lives reduced to a minimum. The plans for rebuilding that faculty have begun considering are workable within the strictures of the MOU: they will keep faculty at a maximum of six courses per year, and will allow the existing number of regular Writing Program faculty, with the aid of a comparable (but slightly smaller) cohort of graduate students, to teach most or all of the Program curriculum in years of normal enrollment. At the same time, the new MOU promises opportunities, via course equivalencies, for Program faculty to work again toward improving writing instruction across all four years of students’ enrollment—and, in doing so, drawing more fully upon the rich intellectual resources the Program has long been known for. As is customary for the Writing Program, the cost—$82,000 in graduate student salaries in 2006-07—is modest in comparison to the gain the campus will receive.

IV. CURRICULUM
As already noted, the Writing Program’s curriculum now consists of courses that enable students to satisfy campus- and systemwide writing requirements, and courses for potential tutors and teachers for this first-year curriculum. This limited curriculum has had consequences for the Writing Program and the campus, most immediately in the unavailability of the Program’s dozen or so W courses at a time of crisis in the campus’s W offerings. While still seeing all the ways in which a full-range Writing Program would be of greatest benefit to the campus, the Program has always believed that its most important responsibility has been to offer outstanding composition courses for first-year students, both ELWR liable and ELWR satisfied. Indeed, about 80% of UCSC students are required to take Writing 2 (formerly Writing 1), and a smaller but still significant percentage—9-10%—must take at least two ELWR-related courses to advance. Our conviction about the centrality of first-year writing has governed our strategy in facing budget crises, drives our rigorous review procedures, informs the preparation we require of graduate student instructors, and motivates our ongoing Program projects and discussions. At our fall 2006 faculty meeting in September, almost all of the faculty

\textsuperscript{14} An important bonus of this proposal is the end of the system of fractional equivalencies, which has nearly outlived its usefulness to the Writing Program and complicates the work of Human Resources staff.
signed up to serve on one of three committees intended to maintain the quality of our remaining curriculum. One group will study and update our course evaluations in light of newly updated guidelines for C1/C2 courses; one will review, revise, and update our existing Standards for Passing Writing 1; and one will analyze and make recommendations about augmenting or adjusting the range of Writing 1/2 courses we offer. These projects have just been launched, but the alacrity with which faculty agreed to serve on these committees stands as a tribute to their commitment to the continuing renewal of excellence in the Program.

**C1/C2 General Education Requirements:** In 2004, the UCSC Academic Senate approved a change to the General Education requirements, transforming the one-quarter lower-division “C” requirement (which most students met by satisfactorily passing Writing 1, Composition and Rhetoric) into a two-quarter sequence, C1 and C2 (which most students meet by taking their college Core courses and Writing 2, Rhetoric and Inquiry). This transformation emerged, in part, from a study produced by the Senate’s Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) examining the efficacy of college Core courses (2002), which recommended the preservation of these courses while recognizing (via wide student survey) that the students whose academic interests were best satisfied were those who had been in ELWR-liable sections of Core, and those least satisfied were those who arrived at UCSC with the strongest writing skills. Core courses, CEP noted, efficiently did a number of things at once: they introduced students to a broadly conceived field of study, acclimated them to college life and to the life of their residential colleges, and initiated their work in academic reading and writing. Core classes were always intended to be courses in academic writing and critical reading (de facto the first of a two-quarter writing sequence, followed by Writing 1), though given the many other purposes of Core classes, individual sections at times drifted from this track. But in light of serious campus exploration into abolishing the Core classes and redefining the first-year experience, the Council of Provosts and the Writing Program developed a proposal to make it explicit—to college provosts, Core faculty, and students—that Core classes were writing classes. This reaffirmed focus shaped subsequent Core course hiring, training of faculty and tutors, and curricular choices. It also helped clearly articulate the relationship between College 80 and Writing 1, and strengthen the pedagogical and administrative bonds between the colleges and the Writing Program. It was this proposal that the Senate approved in spring 2004, setting in motion a process, still ongoing, for the more fluid articulation of Core and what is now called Writing 2.

The introduction of the new C1/C2 requirements in fall 2005 was notable for several reasons. First, they represent a significant improvement to writing instruction without a significant increase in funding, or any increase at all—itself a major achievement in a period of consternation of over UC- and campuswide budget cuts. Students were not liable for additional courses, and no additional instructors needed to be hired.

Second, the new requirements improve the old system pedagogically by (a) regularizing the expectations for C1 and C2 classes across colleges and between the colleges and the Writing Program, and (b) establishing appropriate writing instruction for first-year students at all levels of writing expertise. A committee of representatives from the
Writing Program and the Council of Provosts drafted and received approval for a set of objectives for C1 and C2 courses. Modeled, in part, on the Writing Program’s Goals and Common Practices for Writing 1, and attentive to the Writing Program Administrators’ Outcomes Statement for First-Year Composition, this document (Educational Objectives of the C Requirement, Appendix F) establishes the aims of all composition courses at UCSC and distinguishes between the expectations for C1 (Introduction to University Discourse) and C2 (Rhetoric and Inquiry). Though the system is so new that no method for assessing the continuity of C1 classes within and across colleges has yet been devised, with clear objectives for C1 and C2 classes the articulation between Core and Writing 2 should be smoother and students should be more uniformly prepared for Writing 2.

Attentive to CEP’s report on Core, the new requirements also improve instruction for the most able first-year writers. Under the old system, students could enter UCSC having satisfied the C requirement by exam score (an 11 or 12 on the Analytical Writing Placement Exam, a 4 or 5 on the English AP, etc.) or by passing a qualifying college-level writing class with a grade of C or better. Not required to take Writing 1 (which satisfied the C requirement), these students’ sole experience of composition instruction at UCSC took place in the context of Core courses whose writing goals had not then been fully articulated and whose expectations varied from college to college. Under the new system, such students enroll in C2 sections of Core—sections that are the equivalent of Writing 2 and that now have well-defined objectives—and thus all students take a college composition course at UCSC. (This is also an improvement for the students who would once have cleared both the old Subject A and C requirements via a single transferable community college course, as such courses vary considerably in quality and rigor.)

Finally, the establishment of the new system highlights the cross-curricular cooperation possible even when no further resources are available. The collaboration of college provosts and Writing Program faculty produced a major improvement in the first-year curriculum while preserving what was best about it, and simultaneously cemented the already close working relationship between these units. In addition, College Writing Coordinators and other Writing Program faculty teaching in the colleges have played an important role in advising and mentoring college faculty colleagues, and provosts have encouraged college faculty to participate in Writing 203, the pedagogy course in teaching writing offered to graduate students each spring. The fruitful collaboration between colleges and Writing Program and the ongoing relationships it has inspired serves as a model of what the Program and campus can do even when other opportunities are unavailable.

One challenge immediately posed by the new system involved the swift transformation of Core classes from unofficial to official writing classes. Core faculty, who in many cases had taught in the colleges for years, were now expected to teach writing courses with specific educational objectives, and would be held responsible for meeting those objectives. Cognizant of the pressure those changes placed on faculty and on college provosts (who were now heads of writing courses), then-Chair Roz Spafford applied for and received a major instructional improvement grant to fund professional development efforts for Core faculty. Senior Lecturer SOE Carol Freeman led this effort, conducting
meetings and workshops with each of the ten college faculties, soliciting contributions for and then writing a substantial and excellent booklet for Core course instructors (Appendix G), and serving as a diplomatic emissary at large.

One other concern lingers. While the Writing Program and the colleges jointly administer the C1 and C2 requirements, and confer regularly on such matters as exemptions from requirements for transfer students and, via Core faculty meetings, on pedagogy, for the most part the oversight of the requirements is divided. The Writing Program is responsible for the majority of C2 classes; it is directly responsible for hiring and reviewing instructors for about half of the ELWR-liable C1 classes (those it funds directly); via the work of ELWR Coordinator Maria Cecilia Freeman, the Writing Program also oversees the progress of all ELWR-liable C1 students, regardless of the funding source of their classes. The colleges, via individual provosts, are responsible for the ELWR-satisfied C1 students, and are also responsible for hiring and reviewing instructors for Core sections of C2 (almost all of which are college-funded) and ELWR-liable C1 classes. The provosts have been responsible, attentive partners in this process, but it is likely that differences will surface in, for example, 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 (relatively frequent) and the Writing Program (less frequent). We have in place an excellent record of collaboration that models responsible stewardship of these requirements; we may need to extend this relationship via more explicit discussions about such topics as faculty hiring and reviews.

**ELWR classes:** Annually, about 35-40% of entering first-year students are liable for the Entry Level Writing Requirement. About 78% of them generally satisfy the ELWR by exam or appeal portfolio at the end of the first quarter of writing instruction, having been enrolled in special sections of the required (C1) college Core classes taught by trained writing instructors. This economical arrangement helps students satisfy two requirements (ELWR and college Core) without sending them to an extra class. Students who do not clear the ELWR in fall may enroll in up to three more classes—Writing 20 (The Nature of Written Discourse), Writing 21 (Meaning and Style: The Sentence in Context), and Writing 23 (Grammar and Rhetoric: Language for Writing)—designed to help them do so. About 9-10% of incoming students need two classes to satisfy the ELWR, perhaps 3% need three, and a very small percentage require four. Though the classes are meant to assist students in passing the ELWR, they are not test-preparation classes, but rigorous, college-level writing and reading courses, and performance in a course is independent of satisfying the ELWR. Students enrolled in the Writing 20 series may satisfy the requirement by exam or portfolio (two papers in several drafts apiece, a sample of in-class timed writing, a substantial letter introducing the student’s work) scored by two writing instructors, a system that recognizes the limitations of timed writing exams for testing effective academic writing. If they do not satisfy the ELWR by the end of their fourth quarter of enrollment, they are barred from further enrollment until they can satisfy it. Though few students annually are barred—there were nine in 2005—the numbers of students at risk of being barred have increased precipitously in recent years, from 14 in 2001 to 42 in 2005. Many managed to meet the requirement only after four quarters of
hard work with considerable writing support from instructors and tutors—support at a level that does not continue for these students thereafter.

Tutoring support is now available to ELWR students on a fee-for-service basis via the Writing Assistance Program, with fee waivers available to eligible students. The Writing Program offers some limited fee abatements to students not eligible for fee waivers but unable to afford the fee, and trains Writing Assistants in Writing 169, Theory and Practice of Tutoring Writing. Humanities Human Resources handles payroll and the legal paperwork for hiring tutors, but most administrative infrastructure (enrolling students in the Writing Assistance Program, billing for services, logging tutors’ timesheets) and some additional training is now provided by Learning Support Services. Via Director Holly Cordova’s mounting concern for English language learners, Learning Support Services has also paid for most of the sections of Writing 22A, a grammar and editing workshop for ELL students that the Writing Program offers but can’t afford to fund, and bankrolls Writing 159, the grammar course for tutors and prospective teachers expecting to work with ELL students. EOP covers the cost of tutoring for qualified students. Until funding cuts imposed in 2003, the Writing Program, aided by EOP funds for qualified students, was able to support free tutoring for all students enrolled in ELWR classes, via workload-credit tutorials (Writing 10A, 10B, 10C) that were cut concurrently with funding. Participation in tutoring was then close to 100%. As a recent Writing Program proposal to restore tutoring funding out of student fees indicates, the introduction of the fee-for-service model, while a useful stopgap, had several negative consequences. “Data from fall 2003, the first quarter in which the fee was charged,” the proposal notes, show that “Fewer students satisfied ELWR in the fall, 11% fewer students received writing tutoring than during the previous year, 11% more students enrolled in Writing 20 in the winter, and 52% more enrolled in writing 21 in the spring. These data seem to validate the importance of writing assistance as a support for incoming students who do not fulfill ELWR prior to coming to UCSC.”15 It may also be that the two units of workload credit had symbolic value to students, giving them a way to understand that the work with a writing assistant had the stature of a course and was valued as academic work by the institution.

In 2004-2005, with a fall first-year enrollment of 3,122, the Writing Program offered 10 sections of Writing 20 and 3 sections of Writing 21. In 2005-2006, despite a drop in first-year fall enrollment to 2,950, the Writing Program filled 12 sections of Writing 20 and 4 sections of Writing 21. In 2006-07, with an enrollment estimated at 3375, we anticipate offering a minimum of 14 sections of Writing 20 and possibly more, and 3 sections of Writing 21. Demand for ELWR classes, in general, has been growing, an apparent consequence of a larger group of under-prepared students entering UCSC.

15 Since the loss of funds for tutoring, the Writing Program and Learning Support Services have sought replacement funds annually through applications to the Student Fee Advisory Committee, most recently in August 2006 (Appendix H). This year, the Writing Program intends to propose a student bond issue that would assess a small sum against every student’s quarterly fees to cover the cost of writing tutoring.
**English language learners (ELL):** Except for a workshop class (Writing 22A, Grammar and Editing) offered to first-quarter freshmen concurrently taking Core, UCSC does not have a separate ESL program, preferring instead to integrate English language learners into the regular curriculum rather than segregating them into separate courses or pre-ELWR “ESL” classes. Thus, by Academic Senate-approved exception, UCSC students have four quarters, rather than the usual three, to satisfy the ELWR. Each successive ELWR class in the Core/Writing 20 series accommodates a larger percentage of English language learners, and the series is designed to accommodate these students. This practice has made it possible for ELL students to receive instruction without being stigmatized or marginalized. But it places special pressure on the Writing Program to provide instruction suited to students with language challenges. A recent proposal by the Committee on Preparatory Education recommends several measures, at modest cost, that will improve the Writing Program’s offerings to ELL students and, in general, better equip ELWR students for success within and beyond the university. (See Appendix C.) The first of these, the replacement of a three-unit fourth-quarter workshop class (Writing 22B, Grammar and Editing) by a five-unit composition class (Writing 23, Grammar and Rhetoric), has already been implemented; the Program is preparing for implementation of a second—enforcement of a long-neglected Senate regulation mandating that students continue to enroll in ELWR-related courses until they satisfy the requirement or are barred. Several other recommendations have yet to be implemented, including the restoration of workload-credit tutorials for students in ELWR classes; the introduction of a winter editing workshop (Writing 22B) for ELL students to run concurrently with Writing 20; and seed funds for preliminary development of a longitudinal study of the effects of changes in UCSC’s student population and course offerings on undergraduate education and retention. The proposal suggests that for a minimum investment (about $40,000 per year), the Program can significantly better the prospects of UCSC’s increasing population of ELL students, and simultaneously contribute to campus efforts to retain a diverse student population.
Writing 1/Writing 2 classes: In 2005-06, the Writing Program ran 86 sections of Writing 1/2 and three C2 sections of Stevenson College’s winter Core class; in 2006-07, we expect to run 97 Writing 1/2 classes plus the three college classes—a succinct illustration of why enrollment-sensitive funding makes sense. Each section of Writing 1/2 is independently designed by its instructor in accordance with an agreed-upon set of guidelines—formerly the Writing 1 Goals and Common Practices, and now the Educational Objectives of the C Requirement and the Specific Goals of C1 and C2. Several of these courses make modest use of innovative teaching technology—blogs, YahooGroups—or ask students to write for the web as an experiment in audience and form. Many of our Writing 1/2 classes center around a specific topic or theme: writing about the Vietnam War and cultural memory, travel literature, graphic novels, social justice; others present themselves as courses in rhetoric, argument, or the essay. (See Appendix I.) We have recently found it useful to think of each of these courses as presenting students with a site of “inquiry” (hence Rhetoric and Inquiry, the title of Writing 2): understanding that each course has an inquiry of its own neatly sidesteps the perennial, problematic distinction between thematic or “content-based” writing courses and those in which students read and write about writing.

Our guiding principles, in combination with a system of personnel reviews that offers a rigorous assessment of faculty excellence and an occasion for professional development, enable the Program to foster a rich diversity of pedagogical approaches while maintaining quality and continuity across courses. In addition to addressing the expectations of C1 classes, all Writing 1/2 classes teach approaches to finding and employing an array of different sources; all assign papers of substantial length; all teach not just accuracy but also style. There is a great deal of room for freedom in the classroom so long as instructors meet the expectations of the C2 requirements. Previous external review reports have commended the effectiveness and excellence of Writing Program faculty, and personnel reviews regularly confirm that evaluation.

A Writing 1/2 assessment project launched in pilot form in 2003, after months of research, rich discussion, and planning by a faculty committee made up of LSOEs and continuing and pre-six NSF, mirrors the role of personnel reviews for Writing 1/2 as a whole. Spurred by a healthy self-reflective impulse from within the Program (how well did we meet our stated goals and practices?), a then-looming WASC review particularly interested in “outcomes assessment,” and (not least) an unprecedented skepticism about the Writing Program’s purpose and rigor from within our own Division, Program faculty decided to define the process of assessment ourselves to make it as useful as possible to the Program. A most important early decision about purpose separated the assessment project from individual personnel reviews: the aim of the project was to assess the consistency of Writing 1/2, not the work of individual students or teachers—work already thoroughly evaluated in different circumstances. The Assessment Committee settled upon a multi-part approach involving both assessment of outcomes within Writing 1/2 classes and information gathering about expectations for student writing competencies from faculty across the disciplines. After several pilot efforts, the Program settled on an efficient, inexpensive approach to outcomes assessment: using a rubric (Appendix J) to
assess two substantial late-quarter papers that use sources, randomly selected from each Writing 1/2 class in a given quarter, plus the student’s self-assessment. (The latter uses a standard format for consistency’s sake.) The Program’s two formal assessments, thus far (we took last year off) have yielded interesting and helpful results, and the Program has devoted substantial time in each of two successive fall faculty retreats to discussing these results. We have found both gratifying consistency and some surprising discrepancies—mostly around the use of sources—that have provided us with valuable information about the Program and excellent sites for further professional discussion. A project for the immediate future involves folding C2 sections of college Core classes into the regular assessment of Writing 1/2 classes (a first effort was made in the first year of C1/C2 but the reading has not yet taken place). Doing so will not only integrate Core teachers of C2 into the regular conversations around pedagogy shared by Writing Program faculty, but will help define and bring consistency to C2 courses, whether Core or Writing 1/2.

One part of the assessment project—convening faculty from across the campus to talk about their expectations of student writing—will probably launch this year, in the context of the three Program subcommittees announced at our fall meeting. Both the committee reviewing Writing Program course offerings and the committee revising the Program’s Standards for Passing will likely convene faculty focus groups to help establish the context within which the Writing Program does its work. We expect these encounters to be most informative.

Upper-division classes: The Writing Program currently offers only two upper-division courses during the academic year, both training classes for tutors: Writing 159 and Writing 169, both mentioned in the discussion of tutoring, above. Writing 159 has been taught by ELWR Coordinator Maria Cecilia Freeman. In recent years, Writing 169 has typically been taught by pairs of Program faculty working in tandem for two years. Though a three-year cycle would better serve the teachers and the classes, allowing instructors to work the kinks out of a course and then perfect it, there are so few opportunities to teach upper-division students that it has seemed wise to rotate the teaching roster every couple of years.

The Program takes the same approach to summer session, when we typically offer one upper-division W course in each of the 5-week sessions and make an effort to rotate courses and teachers. Demand for W courses encouraged us to run three courses in summer 2006, all of which fully enrolled: classes in academic writing and research methods, the rhetoric of the social sciences, and journalism.

Teaching upper-division classes is important not just for variety—though variety is helpful—but also because upper-division writers remind us of the direction in which our first-year students are heading. Contact with more sophisticated writers coping with more sophisticated problems enriches our teaching of lower-division students and helps us remember what we’re teaching toward.
A note: The campus is suffering a bottleneck in W courses, the result of decisions by the Academic Senate in the late 1990s and insufficient subsequent oversight.\textsuperscript{16} In the late 1990s, the Senate made an important change to the writing General Education requirements, removing the “W” designation from sections of freshman Core classes taken by students who had already satisfied the ELWR (then Subject A) and making the C requirement a pre-requisite for the W. Though W courses are not required to be upper-division courses, this change emphasized the discipline- or field-specific quality of the requirement and encouraged students to seek W courses after declaring a major and becoming familiarized with the expectations of academic writing. At about the same time, however, the Senate rejected a revision to the General Education requirements that (among other things) would have made the W a departmental or major requirement. The result of the latter decision is being felt today: because departments have not been held responsible for ensuring that their own students have W courses in their field of study, some departments have not provided them, or provided too few. Intent upon satisfying their degree requirements, students have crossed over to W courses in other disciplines, classes with no departmental pre-requisites—in some cases so overrunning the courses that, in self-protection, the affected departments have removed the W, restricted access to the classes, or cancelled the courses. As a result, a significant number of students in 2005-06 were at risk of not graduating. CEP has been at work resolving this crisis, but there are further challenges ahead. The Writing Program, watching from the sidelines, would be most willing to share its roster of W courses, including several (Writing in the Arts, Rhetoric of the Natural Sciences) that would immediately relieve pressure in those Divisions.\textsuperscript{17} A preliminary suggestion to the two biology departments (among the most affected by the W crisis) that they and their Division fund the cost of a class was met with interest, but was turned down by the Humanities Division.

Teaching classes, however, is not the only way the Writing Program could help the campus improve its record on writing-intensive courses. The additional course equivalencies we expect the new funding MOU will produce will produce considerable opportunity for Writing Program faculty to work closely with faculty in the disciplines. Here the richness of Program faculty’s educational backgrounds could come usefully into play, allowing them to consult on W course design or assignments, to help work with graduate student TAs on assigning and assessing student writing, and more, from within some knowledge of the other discipline. Faculty in the disciplines are more likely to consider teaching W courses if support is available to them, and Writing Program faculty are well positioned to work with them.

\textbf{Graduate classes:} The Writing Program offers a single graduate-level class, Writing 203, Teaching Writing. Participants in the course who satisfactorily complete it are

\textsuperscript{16}Former Writing in the Disciplines Coordinator Virginia Draper anticipated this problem some years ago in a report to then-VP/DUE Lynda Goff. Writing Program Chair Elizabeth Abrams is currently serving, in much diminished capacity, as WID Coordinator.

\textsuperscript{17}A list of the Writing Program’s writing-intensive courses may be found at http://reg.ucsc.edu/catalog/html/programs_courses/04_06Catalog/04_06writCourses.htm
eligible to teach Writing 1/2, and usually do so by teaching from the syllabi they develop within the class. The class has been highly successful in attracting graduate students from across the campus, part of its original aim. As a result, graduate students in History, Literature, History of Consciousness, Anthropology, Sociology, Earth Sciences, Environmental Sciences, Psychology, Philosophy, Linguistics, Film and Digital Media, Ocean Sciences, and other fields have passed through the class, and many of them have gone on to teach Writing 1/2 courses of their own. (The course has also attracted Core course lecturers interested in developing their knowledge of writing pedagogy in the wake of the C1/C2 requirement. Such lecturers have included a predatory bird specialist, a poet, two literary scholars, a historian, and a film reviewer and former chef.)

Graduate students who go on to teach Writing 1/2 are closely mentored in their first several quarters of teaching: a faculty mentor consults on adjustments to class design and writing assignments, visits classes, reviews comments on student papers, and responds to the usual array of questions and requests. Graduate students teaching for the first or second time also attend bi-weekly group mentoring meetings, small workshops or seminars run by a faculty mentor for all graduate students teaching in a particular quarter, and meant to promote sharing of materials and experiences and to provide a supportive peer group. New pool lecturers also often attend.

V. ADMINISTRATION
The Writing Program has always distributed administrative responsibilities among its faculty rather than concentrating them in one or two people, finding this approach both expedient—all faculty have a stake in the smooth working of the Program—and essential. Administrative decisions on budget, curriculum planning, and course assignments are made by the Chair, in consultation with other Program faculty. Program faculty administer and oversee the Program; from the time Don Rothman and Carol Freeman were promoted to LSOE status and became Senate members, outside faculty have participated only as outside members of LSOE search committees and invited members of ad hoc initial continuing review committees. As of this year, all NSF reviews and decisions will be conducted wholly by members of the Personnel Committee, who are elected by the faculty and led by the Program Chair. The Program has recently revised its personnel procedures to meet the expectations of the new NSF MOU and to preserve its interest in maintaining the excellence of the faculty. (See Appendix K for procedures.) NSF participate in search committees for new pool and program faculty, and, by exception to Senate By-Law 55, participate in LSOE search committees (they are appointed by the Chair). Program faculty also share responsibility for the curriculum, with no distinctions of status or rights made between full-time and part-time faculty members18 and every faculty member is required to teach at least one freshman course (a

18 The union MOU draws its main distinction between pre-six and continuing lecturers. The Writing Program honors the terms of the MOU but does distinguish between truly contingent faculty—members of our pool—and regular NSF who were hired with the expectation of 50% minimum annual appointments, are expected to perform regular Program duties such as scoring Analytical Writing Placement Exams and are paid for these extra duties, and so on.
stricture developed in the days of a full curriculum!). NSF also participate fully in other committee work, and are chairing all three committees launched at this year’s faculty retreat. College Writing Coordinators share administrative duties at each of the ten residential colleges—a geographical necessity given how ELWR is embedded in college Core classes. Given the work each of them does, it is also a necessity of time: no single or even two administrators could do the work the CWCs accomplish, as efficiently as they do it. (The Council of Provosts concurs, and all college provosts recently agreed to contribute, at Writing Program request, an additional sixth of a course equivalency to compensate CWCs for their service to the colleges. See Appendix L for description of CWC duties, by unit served. The Provosts agreed to this contribution for one year, after which they will revisit the issue. It is their position that more appropriate sources of funding are the Humanities Division and the campus.)

With fluctuations in funding over the years, some administrative positions—coordinator of Writing 1, associate Chair, co-coordinators of Writing in the Disciplines, mentoring of graduate students teaching in the Program, writing consultant to graduate students in other units—have come and gone, or have been more or less funded. Currently, a number of duties are concentrated in the Chair of the Program that have, at other times, been distributed via equivalencies: it is a goal of Chair Abrams to redistribute some of these duties via the equivalencies we expect the new funding MOU will generate, a much healthier situation for the Program (and the Chair). Though in the early days of the Program, the Chair also oversaw the ELWR (then Subject A), for many years that position has been independent and growing.

**Administrative staff and morale:** The Writing Program is expertly staffed by Program Manager Laurel Woodside (100%). The Program Assistant II position, now open, will be staffed at 75% time over ten months and 50% time over two months in the summer. Total staff FTE is thus 1.71. The Program Manager’s main responsibilities include assisting the Chair and providing staff support for personnel actions, budget administration, academic recruitments, curriculum planning, program planning, external reviews, space planning, staff personnel actions and recruitment, and special projects. The Program Assistant provides staff support for scheduling and curriculum planning, undergraduate advising and student support, maintaining and updating the website and databases, and general Program administration. Since the last review in 1998, Laurel Woodside’s position has been reclassified from Student Affairs Officer I to Management Services Officer I. Funding for a staff assistant position has fluctuated considerably over the last eight years. In 1998, it was funded at .625 FTE (75% ten months); in 1999 the Program supplemented the position to bring it up to .83 FTE (100%, ten months), and in 2000-01 to .91 FTE (100%, eleven months). Because the Writing Program was unable to continue supplementing the position, it was reduced to .625 FTE starting in spring 2001. In summer 2004, with the departure of the then-assistant, the position was further reduced to a permanent FTE of .42 (50% time, ten months), then returned in 2005 to .625, before being increased by request in summer 2006 to its current level, albeit still unfilled—a considerable worry given the recruitment, external review, and large number of major personnel reviews the Program has scheduled for this year.
The fluctuations in funding have been matched by fluctuations in staffing. Since the last review, the Program has had five staff assistants and several periods, including now, of no assistant at all while the Program awaited Divisional decisions on funding (which would affect the pool of applicants) or while the Program Manager conducted long searches through disappointing pools of applicants. Though we are pleased that after many years negotiating the size of the position it has been increased somewhat and does away with the summer furlough, we believe that the relatively low classification of the position as Assistant II, combined with the part-time position, has affected the quality of our applicant pool.

Positive changes notwithstanding, even when we do have a staff assistant in place, Program staff struggle to meet the enormous demands on their time. The Program’s many-faceted operations and its administration of two major UC and UCSC requirements, which require complex interactions with units all over campus; the complex nature of its faculty’s part-time, often multi-unit, and sometimes shifting appointments; and students’ need for information and guidance with respect to writing requirements create a situation in which meeting deadlines and satisfying the needs of the Writing Program faculty, students, and other campus units is challenging indeed. (While the funding MOU now under negotiation will ease the complexity of faculty appointments, the Program Manager will still need to craft their appointments, oversee their reviews, and closely track the responsibilities assigned in the equivalency portion of their appointments.) The introduction of the campus Academic Information System (AIS) has worked well for students but has increased workload for staff who need to retrain in the new system. (Learning the new system has been complicated by the Writing Program’s unique enrollment demands—e.g., half-enrolling Writing 1/2 classes to save room for ELWR students awaiting Analytical Writing Placement Exam results, and simultaneously enrolling students in Writing 1 and Writing 2 classes that have the same teacher, meet at the same time, and have a joint enrollment cap of 25.) A new campus system for all business transactions (account access, purchasing, travel, entertainment, and so on) has also been time-consuming, as have the near simultaneous transformations in Instructional Technology and Staff Human Resources. In the last several years, the situation has been further exacerbated by the steady shifting of work to the Program office from other units on campus (a dynamic affecting all departments and colleges), numbers of graduate student and pool instructors in need of appointments, orientation, and office space, and, especially, a considerable increase in the number of freshman enrollments and the classes the Program runs to accommodate them. In fall 1998 the campus had 9938 undergraduates enrolled, 2360 of them new freshmen; in fall 2005, with the same 1.625 staff FTE, the campus had 13,600 undergraduates and 2950 new freshmen. Perhaps more to the point, in that period we went from 8.5 to 17.5 ELWR-related courses after Core, an increase in classes that underscores the repeated contacts with the Writing Program that occur when the population of ELWR-labile students increases.

As Manager Woodside notes, the many new systems, policies, and procedures introduced hard upon one another make it profoundly difficult for 1.71 staff to be adequately trained in all of them, and the plethora of major changes within a short time span have added to
workload and stress in the office. Student help is not practical, she says, because the need for specialized training and the requirements of confidentiality would restrict access to student records as well as to much faculty information. From the point of view of the students and faculty who populate and teach our classes, UCSC quite economically merges three major efforts—first-year composition, ELWR, and ESL—into a single unit. On other UC campuses there are separate units, and separate staffs, for each of these operations. While we do not claim that we thus need three times as many staff appointments as we currently have—there are economies of scale in place—we think it is clear that the classification of the staff assistant position should be raised and the allocation of staff FTE should be increased.

One illustration will help make the point. Currently, because of limitations on staff time, the Writing Program office provides no staff support to the ELWR Coordinator. We are currently searching for a new Coordinator of ELWR and ELL, now reclassified as a Senate-level position. As the job advertisement indicates (see Appendix M), a large part of the administrative work associated with this position involves working with the Registrar’s office, college advising, and Learning Support Services. What the advertisement doesn’t indicate is what the current Coordinator does. Among many other tasks more appropriate to staff than to faculty and on other campuses so assigned, she engages AIS to place holds on students’ enrollments; hand-delivers exam results to the Registrar; keeps records on every student held for the ELWR; books rooms for exam-scoring sessions; produces letters to students at risk of being barred; types up and photocopies prompts; and assembles boxes of blue books and pencils, dictionaries and prompts, for the five annual Analytical Writing Placement Exams. (See Appendix N, an informal list of the tasks the ELWR Coordinator performs.) No staff support is available through her college, and it is likely that none will be forthcoming for the new Coordinator either, now that Humanities Faculty Services staff are decamping to the new Humanities building while Writing Program faculty remain in the colleges. Moving any of these tasks or the myriad other staff or clerical duties that the Coordinator performs to the Writing Program office would increase pressure on staff already overworked, even when the office is fully staffed. But not assigning some of this work to staff will surely give our ELWR Coordinator applicants pause. Expecting a Senate faculty member to do clerical work is not a good use of time or resources.

In 1998, the last review team indicated that increasing staff support should be considered a top priority, a recommendation that Dean Hankamer signaled he would set aside, noting that “Writing was no more understaffed than other units in the division.” That may have been true then (though we have our doubts); today, the combination of a too-low job classification and a percent time that rules out staff support for one of the key Program administrators makes it unlikely that is still the case.

VI. FUTURE GOALS

The external review team has been asked to address the status and role of graduate students in the Writing Program, and the role the Writing Program might play in supporting upper-division students and W courses, topics we have taken up in other sections of this document and also in our Academic Plan. Two other questions—the
placement of the Program in the Humanities Division, and whether the administration has provided the Program with a clear description of its role on campus—are best left to the review committee to address. We do note, however, that under the promise of a new, more transparent, and more equitable funding agreement and the new administration of Dean Van Den Abbeele, our position in the Humanities Division is becoming clearer and more encouraging. The often-dismissive attitude, easy acceptance of the role of the Writing Program as a provider of “service” teaching alone and the devaluation of such teaching, as well as the language of “burden” and “drag” used for a period to describe the Program’s effect on the Division—all these have given way.19 We are now once again being referred to—and, we hope, thought of—as an asset to the Division and the campus.

Here we would like to sketch briefly some of the ideas that emerged out of our faculty retreat in September. After years of austerity and limits, during which Program faculty nevertheless not only performed their required work but improved the Program, we believe we are again in a position to imagine the future. The new funding MOU promises stability and sufficient flexibility to consider expansion without considerable extra investment. Though the outlines of the new MOU have emerged too recently—and are as yet too tentative—for the Program to have begun serious planning, we have many hopes and ideas.

At that meeting, we began by first acknowledging several elements that characterize our teaching and represent common values of Program faculty:

- We link the teaching of writing with the construction of our society. We believe our work with students on critical reading and writing equips them for active citizenship in a democracy.

- We believe our classes enact the goals of the larger research university while also preparing students for full participation in it. We believe our attention to beginners is fully consistent with the mission of the research university.

- We see our classes as communities and contributors to communities.

Given these values, we ask: How shall we frame our relationship with the rest of the campus? How can we make what we know more available and useful to the rest of the campus? And how can a Writing Program whose teaching focuses on first-year writing help educate students across the full four years of their enrollment?

19 The attitude that the Writing Program is a “service” unit only has also made its way into the recently released draft Campus Academic Plan, which draws on the draft Divisional Academic Plan of winter 2006. It is our hope that the final iterations of both of these documents will demonstrate a more expansive vision of the role the Writing Program may play in the Division and on the campus.
Faced with these questions, Writing Program faculty came up with several interlocking rings of potential projects and activities that would strengthen the Program and contribute to undergraduate education at UCSC.

(1) **Research:** How can research within the Writing Program serve the campus as a whole? We considered research on transfer students’ readiness for upper-division university writing, on kinds and amounts of writing assigned within disciplines and how Writing Program classes anticipate them, on the writing competencies expected of students by faculty in the disciplines, and so on. Local, UCSC-related research with obvious implications for practices both within and beyond the Writing Program will simultaneously focus the Program, promote familiarity with the latest research in composition studies, and benefit the campus. Two of the Program’s current projects (reviewing and updating our now somewhat dated Standards for Passing Writing 1 and reviewing our current Writing 1/2 course offerings) will likely serve as introductory models of such work. (These projects are part of a recurring cycle of self-reflective practice that gave rise in the first place to the current Standards and the current course offerings.) Another promising intersection between research and practice involves the current campus focus on undergraduate retention and diversity. One very preliminary idea: convening consistent, regular student editing groups for English language learners and following their progress over four years as a means of determining how success in writing affects their progress at the university.

(2) **Mentoring and professional development:** New teachers—lecturers and graduate students—are assisted at several levels in the Program, from the formal mentoring relationships faculty have with graduate students teaching writing to the work College Writing Coordinators do with new lecturers in college Core courses. A more comprehensive system of mentoring might address the issue of professional development for Core instructors less familiar with contemporary thinking in the teaching of writing, and a more robust system of mentoring and professional development might involve assigning mentors to new lecturers in the Writing Program and Core and reviving the Program’s “teaching circle.” This was a highly successful systematic plan for enabling faculty and graduate students to visit each other’s classrooms (apart from the review process), a strategy that helps faculty as a whole familiarize themselves with the Program’s rich and diverse array of practices and approaches and consider best practices.

(3) **Co-curricular work:** Writing Program faculty have, over the years, worked with EOP students and staff, participated in Learning Support Services-funded group tutoring efforts, offered workshops on an array of writing-related issues (e.g., on developing effective writing assignments, commenting on student writing, etc.), consulted with faculty about W course development and assignment design, initiated outreach efforts connecting K-12 students with students in their writing courses, and so on. With equivalency time built into
full- or part-time appointments, Program faculty could once again regularize such offerings rather than conducting them as ad-hoc, volunteer efforts. We would like to reinstitute long-term relationships with other academic units by working with graduate students writing dissertations (as we are often requested—and rarely have time—to do), and envision an array of offerings—a sort of conceptual Writing Center, or a menu of possible co-curricular activities—from which students and faculty across the campus could draw. Program faculty might also consult with TAs responsible for reading and commenting on much of the student writing produced at UCSC, consult with faculty in other departments about the writing of specific students, offer instructional strategies for encouraging responsible use of sources and precluding plagiarism, and more.

These are preliminary ideas but in their inventiveness and range they illustrate the resource the campus has in the Writing Program. It remains to be seen whether UCSC will reawaken to this resource and once again draw on the commitment and expertise of Writing Program faculty in pursuing campus commitments to diversity and excellence. We believe the new funding MOU has the potential to unlock this reserve, but recognize that much hinges on details that have not yet been codified. Both the stability of the first-year program and any prospect of better serving the campus as a whole rest on this new MOU. Until the details emerge, we commit ourselves to our work and continue to dream the future.