INTRODUCTION
UCSC is at a critical moment with regard to its Writing Program. A wave of impending retirements of key writing faculty coincides with the campus's own period of self-reflective planning for the next five to ten years, including its examinations of the writing-intensive (W) requirement (Committee on Educational Policy docket, 2005-06) and funding for the Writing Program (Committee on Planning and Budget report, spring 2005). As soon as possible, the campus needs to make a careful decision about the kind of writing program it wants and how that program should be funded and configured. Can a first-rate education emerge from a campus whose resource commitments for writing concentrate on first-year composition—the current model for the Writing Program? Or should the campus reinvest in an upper-division writing curriculum, the model that prevailed until 2002? Models for both approaches are available at the University of California: UC Irvine, UC Riverside, and UC Berkeley focus on first-year composition; UC Santa Barbara, UC Davis, and UC Los Angeles provide the full range of classes. Certainly the programs at several top universities—among them Harvard, Princeton, and Duke—suggest that it is possible to provide superb undergraduate education via a first-year writing program, provided that a campus also supports upper-division writing courses in the disciplines with appropriate rewards for and mentoring of the faculty teaching them. (Each of those institutions either requires writing-intensive courses in the disciplines or puts significant resources into writing instruction in gateway courses, such as sophomore-level seminars, in the majors.) At the same time, that model leaves unrealized opportunities that the campus may want to pursue.

Whatever approach the campus takes, UCSC’s Writing Program represents an important resource in furthering campus aims for diversity and interdisciplinarity. At present, that resource is underutilized. Some key modifications would have wide impact on efforts to enhance the excellence of a UCSC undergraduate education.

UCSC aims to be a world-class institution. What, then, is the place of the Writing Program at UCSC?

BACKGROUND
Until 2002, UCSC’s Writing Program was a full-service program. It provided a full curriculum of lower-division classes and two minors (Journalism, and Communication and Rhetoric). It offered instruction to students at all levels and provided a number of writing-intensive courses that helped supply the campus with the W-course seats required for students to satisfy General Education requirements. It also provided tutoring to students in first-year writing classes and many in writing-intensive courses in other units; consultations with faculty across the disciplines; and active outreach efforts to a diverse population of teachers and their K-12 students whom UCSC hoped to attract. It is now a first-year writing program, its three remaining courses for upper-division and graduate students designed to prepare those students for tutoring or teaching those in first-year writing classes. Outreach efforts are now strictly voluntary, and Writing in the
Disciplines (WID) is located in a single instructor with one course equivalency. Tutoring is now available almost exclusively to ELWR students and—for most students—for a fee. (A proposal to restore tutoring for the least well-prepared writers via student fees is currently under consideration.) And class sizes for writing courses have increased well beyond the upper limits recommended by several national organizations.

Despite these changes, Writing Program faculty have remained characteristically engaged, participating, for instance, in the creation and adoption of an assessment instrument designed to gauge the effectiveness and stability of the main first-year composition course, and maintaining, despite increased workload and decreased opportunities to participate more broadly in the education of undergraduates, their well-documented excellence as teachers and active citizens of the campus community. The one significant positive curricular change since 2002 has been the campus adoption of the new, two-part composition requirement, C1/C2, launched in fall 2005, which promises to enhance the delivery of writing instruction to first-year students, especially those somewhat stronger writers who, under the old C requirement, would have arrived on campus having exempted the requirement entirely.

The profound, rapid shift in campus priorities and investment in the writing curriculum for undergraduates occurred within the period covered by the last ten-year plan. This shift took place in a climate of budget cuts—to the UC system, the UCSC campus, and the Humanities Division—that more closely resembled an ongoing siege than a period of careful reflection. The changes made to the Writing Program were thus largely reactive, not the result of comprehensive planning for campus needs. We are now in year five of the period covered by the last ten-year document, and in a good position for thoughtful planning. This new document emerges from a more stable notion of the campus profile in the next decade. It thus more accurately addresses both the Writing Program’s needs in order to fulfill its mission and the resources the Writing Program can offer to UCSC as a whole as the campus engages in the process of comprehensive and realistic academic planning.

The 2001 Ten-Year Plan
In their 2001 ten-year planning documents, the Writing Program and the Humanities Division agreed that the mission of the Writing Program was “to provide a curriculum of writing courses for undergraduate students, especially freshmen.” At the behest of the Dean of Humanities, the Writing Program developed a proposal to become a Department of Rhetoric and Communication that the division substantially adopted in its Ten-Year Plan. This new department was to have a curriculum anchored in first-year writing courses for students across the campus, as well as majors, minors, and graduate programs emerging out of the existing minors in Journalism and Rhetoric and Communication. Recruitment priorities grew out of these plans, and out of the expectation of a growing lower- and upper-division undergraduate population.

This plan collapsed almost immediately—in large part, ironically, because of decisions made by the dean who had recommended its major propositions. Budget cuts in the Humanities Division, a change from enrollment-driven funding by the central administration to a fixed budget provided by the Division, and the projected flattening out of the campus’s expected lower-division enrollment profoundly affected the Writing Program. These budgetary exigencies, among others, led to programmatic decisions by the Division: the defunding of the minors and consequent suspension of all the Writing Program’s upper-division courses except those meant to support lower-division system-wide and campus requirements. As a result, after years of praise in external reviews for its pedagogical excellence and imaginative use of limited funds, the UCSC Writing Program is no longer a full-service program.
The Commensurable Funding Policy
The "Commensurable Funding Policy," subsequently implemented by the Dean of Humanities, newly limited both the Writing Program’s funding and its ability to serve the campus as a whole. It has two main provisions: (1) a fixed budget of Temporary Academic Staffing (TAS) funds, set at twelve FTE ($620,400); together with the salaries for the four Lecturers with Security of Employment. these funds are meant to cover the cost of mounting all Writing Program classes; and (2) a set of rules on faculty course buyouts whereby units outside the Writing Program must return to the Division the full per-course salary of any Writing Program faculty member it wishes to employ; in turn, the Division provides $3000 to the Writing Program toward the replacement cost of the course.

The effect of these changes on the Writing Program, its faculty and students, was immediate and considerable. The effect on the campus as a whole has been slower to be felt, but is now emerging.

For the program, the shift from enrollment-driven funding for writing requirements to a fixed block of funds—a shift initiated by the campus’s decentralization of open provisions to the divisions—carried with it an immediate increase in the size of writing classes to among the largest in the UC system (and larger than those at any of our comparison institutions). and has meant that incremental changes to other variables such as size of incoming freshman class, percentage of students who require additional courses to clear the ELWR, and size of lecturers’ merit increases, directly limit the program’s ability to mount the required curriculum of classes for undergraduates without applying to the Humanities Division for further funding. The consequences, as a recent Academic Senate Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) report on the status of Writing Program funding asserts, include considerable challenges to the Writing Program’s ability to plan effectively. severe limits on its ability to remain flexible in response to incremental shifts in enrollment, and over-dependence on last-minute hiring from the pool of temporary lecturers—effects that have consequences, of course, for students. (See appendix.)

For members of the program and the campus as a whole, the impact of the buyout provisions has been equally profound and has effectively prevented the Writing Program from using its most valuable resource. an experienced, superb faculty, to serve the campus. The cost of paying the per-course salary of Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOE) and highly experienced non-Senate faculty (NSF), for instance, deters other units from drawing on the expertise of these educators. And the cost of making up the difference between the $3000 returned for the replacement class and the $5000-$7000 to mount it prevents the Writing Program from releasing them. In total, then, the tax on such course buyouts collected by the division means that their cost far exceeds the standard buyout of $6200 per course.

Under this provision, among other losses, a Writing Program faculty member who was the founding director of the campus’s well-regarded Central California Writing Project had to step down after twenty-seven years; another faculty member, a long-time college Faculty Fellow and former provost, was prevented from coordinating and helping design the college’s freshman Core class: and numerous opportunities for cooperation and collaboration with other departments across campus were stillborn. Isolating instructors in first-year writing ultimately detracts from the program’s ability to serve the campus well. Access to upper-division students and cross-disciplinary experiences students makes faculty into better teachers of freshmen.
Teaching first-year writing courses is the primary mission of all Writing Program faculty, and a responsibility that the faculty respect and embrace. But the campus ignores a most valuable resource for interdisciplinary and interdivisional education when it leashes the faculty in a program meant to serve the campus as a whole.

CPB, in its report on the funding of the Writing Program (2005), recommends that both provisions of the Commensurable Funding Policy be adjusted or removed. On the subject of funding, CPB suggests that "recognition of the mismatch between the needs of the Humanities Division and the needs of the Writing Program lend weight to the idea that a strict enrollment-based funding model might be a good safeguard against potential conflicts in the future" (9). Enrollment-based funding, CPB elsewhere suggests, would significantly ease planning and increase flexibility for curricular planning as well (8). Should the program return to enrollment-driven funding, however, it will be important to calibrate the formula to account for an evidently increasing population of English language learners.

On the matter of course buyouts, the report again recommends a more flexible approach:

The Writing Program has a long history of innovative and highly successful collaborations with other units. For example, senior members of the Writing Program have co-taught W courses in the disciplines and have worked with graduate students in various departments. Now, however, the funding model imposes restrictions so that SOE lecturers cannot teach in other units without risking bankruptcy for either the host units or the Writing Program. Under a chancellor who has made inter-disciplinarity and inter-divisional inter-disciplinarity one of her explicit goals, it seems unnecessarily restrictive to have a funding policy that essentially keeps the Writing Program’s most experienced instructors on a short leash. CPB urges the administration to re-consider the funding model and to make it more flexible. (9)

The Writing Program endorses these recommendations for both LSOEs and non-Senate faculty.

THE WRITING PROGRAM THROUGH 2010-11

With the suspension of the upper-division curriculum, the Writing Program, and the campus, lost a comprehensive and carefully designed series of courses and an opportunity for students at all levels to solidify their writing skills and develop them further in disciplinary and professional contexts. The program also faces the retirements of some of its most experienced and longstanding faculty. Though it retains a roster of superb faculty, responsibility for two major campus writing requirements, and a well-tested lower-division curriculum, the Writing Program is at a critical point in its planning for the future.

Current Responsibilities

In cooperation with the colleges, the Writing Program is responsible for the majority of the lower-division writing curriculum. At UCSC, the University of California Entry-Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) must be satisfied by the end of the fourth quarter of enrollment. Failure to satisfy the ELWR by the end of the fourth quarter means students are barred from further enrollment. Annually, about 35-40% of incoming freshmen at UCSC are liable for the ELWR; about 20% of that number are still liable for it after their first quarter. The Writing Program provides twenty-four courses in the fall and, usually, enough courses—twenty for students entering in fall 2005—during the second, third, and fourth quarters of enrollment to help most students clear the ELWR so they are not barred from further enrollment at the university. The colleges provide enough additional fall courses (twenty-eight in fall 2004) to meet the ELWR
needs of incoming freshmen. Writing Program faculty teach a number of these college-funded sections.

Campus writing requirements also include the C1 and C2 (first-year composition) and W (writing-intensive) General Education requirements. The colleges provide the majority of the C1 curriculum via fall Core courses. The Writing Program provides the majority of the C2 curriculum via Writing 2. About 80% of incoming freshmen take at least one Writing Program class to complete the C2. Writing Program faculty also teach several of the fall C2 sections of Core offered by the colleges. Aside from two or three courses offered during the summer session, the Writing Program no longer offers any classes that satisfy the campus W requirement.

In addition to courses designed for lower-division students seeking to satisfy UC and UCSC requirements, the Writing Program offers three upper-division and graduate-level courses: a grammar course for aspiring teachers, a theory and practice course for writing tutors, and a theory and practice course for graduate students interested in teaching writing.

Resources
Described this way, the Writing Program's mission and scope look limited: to address UCSC's need to meet minimum system-wide and campus requirements for writing competence among students, to provide training for graduate students and advanced undergraduates interested in participating in that mission, and to provide teaching opportunities for graduate students.

From the point of view of UCSC's objectives for itself, however, the Writing Program should correctly be viewed as a resource in furthering campus aims for diversity, interdisciplinarity, and academic excellence, and an essential partner in efforts to promote retention and speed time to degree among undergraduates. The Writing Program serves the entire campus community via the lower-division writing requirements. Through its close and often repeated contact with students held for the ELWR and UCSC's growing population of English language learners (e.g., ESL students and children of immigrants), the program is on the leading edge of the campus's efforts to retain a diverse student population and preparing such students to succeed in the university.

The lower-division requirements are only part of what the Writing Program could provide the campus, especially in light of two considerable challenges UCSC faces in its next five years of growth: an increasing number of transfer students from community colleges needing to manage the transition to university-level writing; and a decreasing number of appropriate W courses for students who need them in order to graduate. The Writing Program is well prepared to help ease both, via its experienced faculty and roster of pre-existing courses. The campus could make efficient use of the resources the program has at hand by lifting the most restrictive provisions of the Humanities Division's Commensurable Funding Policy for programs, and thus enabling the Writing Program's faculty to teach and consult for the benefit of the campus.

- **Transfer students:** Writing Program faculty are the campus experts on the transition to university-level writing. Undergraduate population growth through 2010-11 is expected to emerge mainly from the population of students transferring from California community colleges. Students transferring to the University of California need more academic support than can be provided via Student Affairs. If the campus plans adequately to support the influx of transfer students, Writing Program faculty should be called upon to work with the departments absorbing these students directly into their
upper divisions and to provide services (consultation, classes) to them so that these students can succeed in their chosen majors.

- **Writing-intensive courses:** The Writing Program’s upper-division curriculum, currently on ice, contains a dozen W courses. With the brewing crisis in the number of appropriate W courses available to students who need them to graduate, the campus should consider offering these courses, a number of which could easily be retrofitted for use by other divisions or offered as cross-divisional courses if the faculty could be released to teach them. Writing 103 and 104, for instance—Rhetoric of the Natural Sciences, and Writing in the Arts—would help assuage the W crisis in the Natural Sciences and the Arts while simultaneously easing the pressure on Humanities W courses affected by the large numbers of students from other divisions seeking writing-intensive courses without restrictive pre-requisites.

Whether the campus opts for a first-year or an expanded writing program, the program’s main resources, its faculty and courses, should be considered as the campus plans its future. Thus, though this academic plan lays out the minimum requirements for sustaining the Writing Program’s mission while retaining its intellectual integrity and strength, it also offers both divisional and campus administrations recommendations for a more efficient and effective use of the resources held by the Writing Program to promote campus goals.

**The Next Five Years**
To sustain the mission of continuing to provide excellent writing instruction to undergraduates, the Writing Program must retain the four hard-funded lines for Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOE), slightly recast the curriculum for students who still need to satisfy the ELWR after their first quarter, and continue to work with other departments on campus to understand the expectations for writing in the disciplines and anticipate them, as much as possible, in first-year composition classes. The Writing Program must also continue to work closely with the residential colleges on clearly articulating the move from the C1 composition classes most students take in their first quarter to the C2 courses most will take in the Writing Program by the time they enroll in their seventh quarter.

**ELWR curriculum:** Students who don’t satisfy the ELWR after their first quarter at UCSC have three more quarters to satisfy it before being barred from further enrollment. The ELWR sequence (after fall Core classes) comprises Writing 20 in winter, Writing 21 in spring, and two three-unit “add-on” classes in fall for ELL freshmen (Writing 22A) and fourth-quarter students (Writing 22B). In all but Writing 22A, students attempt to satisfy the ELWR by submitting portfolios of their writing for careful review by writing faculty.

Figures documented by the Writing Program ELWR coordinator strongly suggest that this curriculum needs adjustment, especially for English language learners. There has been a swift and steep upward trend in the number of students at risk of being barred from further enrollment for not satisfying the ELWR, from fourteen in 2001 to forty-two in 2005, many of whom are ELL students. And there is an as-yet undocumented number of students who legitimately satisfied the ELWR but who need more than one quarter to clear the C2 requirement (by passing Writing 2) and are likely struggling in their writing in other courses as well. A proposal currently being developed by the Committee on Preparatory Education calls for the following changes to the ELWR sequence:
• Require Writing 20, currently an elective course, of students who do not satisfy the ELWR in the first quarter. Whether or not it were formalized as a requirement, capturing more ELWR-unsatisfied students by means of this change would increase the number of Writing 20s offered annually. (Estimating from figures for Winter 2006 it would likely mean offering four or five more sections at twenty-two students apiece). On the other hand, it would likely reduce the number of sections of Writing 21 needed to two (from the usual three), as students who currently take two quarters to satisfy the ELWR would accomplish that sooner. Satisfying the ELWR sooner would mean quicker passage into C2 courses. particularly important now that the C2 must be satisfied by the time the seventh quarter begins.

• Offer three-unit Writing 22 language workshops to ELL students in winter (and possibly spring) as add-ons to their five-unit ELWR classes. Two sections in winter would likely suffice, and one—if any—in the spring. Adding language support workshops to courses that focus mainly on the work of writing purposeful, well-structured, and well-supported essays should help ELL students satisfy the ELWR sooner and—both for those who satisfy sooner and those who don’t—give them more practice in editing their own prose, a skill they will need in all their future classes. Frontloading language support early on in their UCSC educations will help these students satisfy the ELWR earlier and diminish the risk that they’d need to repeat Writing 2 to satisfy the C2 requirement.

• Replace the two three-unit Writing 22B workshops for fourth-quarter students ELWR students with a five-unit class, Writing 23, that focuses on all aspects of writing, with special attention to rhetorical grammar. Students who require four quarters to satisfy the ELWR generally need more than a grammar and language workshop. This course would better prepare students with serious writing challenges to succeed in subsequent classes. This arrangement would require a net increase of three to four new five-unit classes, two new three-unit classes, and the conversion of one course from three to five units. Calculated at the median cost per Writing Program class, plus benefits, these additions would add up to about $35,000-$43,000. (Less benefits, which are not charged to the Writing Program’s budget, the cost to the Writing Program would be about $28,000-$34,000.) The cost of these changes would rise if a proposal to cap ELWR classes system-wide at 20 students. offered by UCEP and the Academic Council, is approved. The cost of these changes will be partially offset by fewer repeaters in C2, and thus fewer Writing 2 classes—perhaps one or two fewer classes.

As important, the cost of the changes would likely be offset by effects on diversity, by helping the students we admit succeed at UCSC. The program’s role in this effort is especially significant in light of its status as the only academic unit on campus providing direct support to the campus’s growing population of English language learners (e.g., ESL and “Generation 1.5” students). In its ELWR-related courses, the program probably reaches more EOP students and English language learners (ELL) than any other unit on campus, and thus has close and often repeated contact with a significant proportion of the campus’s population of economically disadvantaged students, students from under-resourced high schools, and students of color: the students who provide much of the campus’s claim to diversity, and to whom the campus has as much obligation as to any others. Academic fragility makes some of these students retention risks, and their ability to succeed as writers undoubtedly affects their ability to move through the curricula required for majors and general education. A more robust ELWR curriculum, frontloaded at the beginning of their academic careers, will not only promote diversity and speed time to degree but also encourage academic success.
Overlap with other departments: As this document has established, the Writing Program should provide rich ground for deliberate, inventive overlap with other units in terms both of courses (e.g., its W courses) and faculty expertise it could offer.

Writing Program faculty have historically been in great demand on the campus for their superb teaching and their expertise in an array of academic disciplines. Several non-Senate faculty, for instance, have or have had long-time associations with Environmental Science, Anthropology, and other departments, helping build writing effectively into disciplinary curricula, mentoring graduate students through their own writing, and so on. And faculty can also help other departments understand what they do well pedagogically and what they need to do better, as several Writing Program faculty did in conducting a study with affiliates of the Natural Science Division to understand the importance of writing for science students.

Other kinds of potential overlap, possibly deeper and more deliberate, are just now becoming visible. The Writing Program’s long-standing professional interest in literacy and K-12 education, evident in the outreach work of a number of the faculty, overlaps with courses and professional expertise in Education. And the program’s proposal for a richer set of offerings for ELWR and ELL students and proposed recruitment in Applied Linguistics could bear fruit in collaborations with the Linguistics Department—shared courses, perhaps, or more opportunities for graduate students to teach ELL students in Writing Program classes.

There are, of course significant potential bars to such collaborations. Chief among them is the funding of the Writing Program. Given limited existing and projected resources and many competing demands for them, the division has little incentive to invest in the growth of a program whose courses serve more students outside the division than in it.

Graduate student support: Among the serious unmet needs on this campus is the academic support of graduate students. The Division has worked to the limits of its resources to provide fellowships and teaching assistantships for graduate students in its departments. However, several important kinds of support have eroded in the last ten years, and must be addressed.

The most pressing of these are the language proficiency challenges faced by international graduate students (and by their own students, in turn). There is no systematic English language support for international graduate students at UCSC, and has been none since the retirement of two lecturers involved in such efforts for the Division of Physical and Biological Sciences. The Writing Program’s courses for undergraduate English language learners typically have few if any seats available to graduate students. However, should the ELWR curriculum be expanded as proposed here, additional sections of Writing 22 language workshops funded by the Graduate Division could be taught by writing faculty. This would assist them in immediate, concrete ways.

Graduate students’ writing also needs support. Graduate students often falter as they shift from undergraduate to graduate work or from graduate coursework to independent dissertation production. This phenomenon is a common dilemma faced by writers at all levels: when the context, the audience, the standards of evidence and the terms of discourse change, writers often find themselves uncertain and inarticulate. Interventions by experienced writing faculty still remain productive in Anthropology, where a writing faculty member continues to work with the entering class. Lost to a previous round of budget cuts in 1995-1996 were the two course equivalencies Writing Program faculty had to work individually and in small writing groups with
History of Consciousness and Literature students. While faculty in these departments are expert in the subjects their students pursue, experienced writing instructors can sometimes see immediately what forces are complicating the argumentative strategies or prose styles of a graduate student write. Furthermore, graduate students are famously in awe of their faculty and will sometimes be more willing to seek help from an instructor not in a position to evaluate them. The acknowledgements pages of articles and dissertations completed by students in those years testify to the real usefulness of this service. Its restoration would increase productivity and reduce time to degree; were the Division to see it as cost-effective, the Writing Program would be pleased to provide it.

Finally, the Writing Program has always aspired to be a full partner in the training of graduate students to teach, and has long provided a seminar in teaching writing to those interested in teaching first-year composition at UCSC—Writing 203. (Another course, occasionally offered as a workshop, helps teaching assistants effectively teach writing in disciplinary contexts.) Such courses, though, are a possibility only for those who are interested enough in teaching writing to make time for the coursework and the supervised teaching experience we offer. (A certificate program in the teaching of writing might make the additional work more attractive to graduate students.) A more structured relationship between the Writing Program and departments in the Humanities and across campus might make this opportunity more widely available. For instance, under the UC/UC-AFT non-Senate faculty workload proposal currently under review, which calls specifically for a share of the Writing Program courses to be taught by graduate students, these students would assume responsibility for about fifteen Writing 2 courses annually, under the close mentorship of a Writing Program faculty member.

**Fundraising:** Though the Writing Program has not typically been invited to participate in fundraising efforts for itself or for the division, members are enthusiastic about the prospect. Indeed, the program has much to offer the division in its development aims. As its work coincides with the watchwords of the current administration (diversity, interdisciplinarity) as well as with some of its pressing concerns (retention, time to degree). In addition, faculty interests and achievements are wide-ranging and interesting, and frequently occupy the intersection between the work of the academy and the interests of the public. In recent years, for instance, Writing Program faculty have founded inter-arts magazines, created an on-campus, student-run social justice conference, helped develop James Burke's "Knowledge Web," and produced an intelligent and effective course assessment instrument (of public interest in the era of state-mandated assessments in the schools). Several have been honored with major teaching awards. These achievements are worth touting, and could well attract donor interest in the program and division.

Writing-related operations such as the Central California Writing Project (CCWP) would benefit from development assistance, which would, in turn, benefit the campus. The Writing Project gives the division an immediate outreach opportunity and a way to increase the academic preparation of diverse students by providing professional development opportunities for K-14 teachers. Occasions that enhance the teaching of writing, reading and literature. Writing Program faculty active in the Writing Project have been invited to participate in ICAS (the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates), to advise high school teachers in Merced when they were attempting to prepare their middle-school students to become UC-eligible by the time UC Merced opened, to consult with legislative bodies, to recommend pedagogies for transfer-level writing courses to community college teachers, and so on. A list prohibitively long for this occasion. That is, the Central California Writing Project enables the campus to engage with and transform language-arts education in the state. Until the spring of 2002, when the
Commensurable Funding Policy limited the relationship Writing Program faculty could have with the CCWP. writing faculty had considerable success bringing in grant money for the Writing Project. It is time to reconsider this possibility.

It is also time to reconsider journalism as an occasion for fund-raising. The furor surrounding the suspension of the Journalism minor should be sufficiently in the past to enable the Writing Program and the Division’s Development Office to plan fund-raising efforts for courses, internships, outreach, and summer institutes. Doing so would re-engage a significant population of alumni who will otherwise continue to be alienated from the campus in the wake of the decision to defund and suspend the minor. Some of these alumni are themselves now professional journalists whose public recognition and articulate writing advertise for the program and whose support of the program itself, should be a valuable asset to the campus. And current students—engaged, articulate, thoughtful, diverse—on air and in print would be an excellent advertisement for the Humanities and for the teaching of rhetoric. understood in its broadest context. Finally, development in this area would allow the Humanities to claim its place in any discussion of a graduate program in Public Media.

Some ideas that are worth revisiting in this context include both past achievements and other campus resources that could be tapped. Members of the Writing Program faculty conducted a very successful summer institute for high school teachers of journalism (sponsored by the Central California Writing Project) and for five years did considerable outreach with diverse students in the San Francisco Bay Area and in Merced to attract them to campus. Such efforts further outreach and diversity aims and could serve as occasions for fundraising. As for tapping campus resources, Student Media, an Academic Affairs unit, is very well grounded, providing space, equipment and staff advising for broadcast and print media students, including the many dozens of students putting out literary magazines. Student Media could provide the necessary campus match for grant proposals and donor outreach.

**Staffing:** The Writing Program is staffed by a 100% time program manager and a 75% time (over 10 months) program assistant. The program assistant’s percent time has recently been returned to the current level, a considerable relief to the program manager and chair; it had dropped to 50% time over ten months with the separation of a previous assistant.

The restoration of the 75% position has improved the program’s ability to accomplish its administrative and bureaucratic work in timely fashion. The current staffing level, though much improved, is not sufficient to cover all the work that needs doing: despite the increase in staff time, almost all of the substantial clerical and bureaucratic duties associated with administering the ELWR are still completed by the ELWR coordinator, an academic appointee. The ELWR coordinator has booked rooms for exams, tracked and contacted every student on campus who hasn’t satisfied the ELWR by the end of their second quarter, filed and photocopied, entered changes on students’ records. Though essential work, this is poor use of faculty time.

With the recruitment of an LSOE to serve as campus ELWR coordinator, current staffing levels must be reconsidered. Increasing the staff assistant’s time to at least 100% over ten months would more appropriately distribute the clerical and bureaucratic work of the program, which is swelled by the program’s responsibility for two campus requirements. ELWR and C2.

**Hiring priorities:** Of the four LSOEs currently at work in the Writing Program, one is retiring at the end of 2005-06; one is expected to retire at the end of 2006-07; and one, with over thirty years of service to UCSC, will certainly consider retiring by the end of the period covered by this
document. In addition, of the non-Senate faculty (NSF), one of the program’s premier specialists in composition theory retired in 2004; the campus ELWR coordinator will no longer serve in that capacity after 2006-07; and a number of the program’s other highly experienced NSF are nearing retirement age. The Writing Program will need to conduct a national search in 2006-07 for two LSOEs in order to provide intellectual leadership, maintain pedagogical continuity, and ensure that administrative responsibilities are appropriately covered and fairly distributed. Barring unforeseen increases in freshman enrollments, subsequent recruitments will depend upon faculty retirements (both LSOE and NSF), the possibility of shared hires with other departments, and the vision the campus has for the role of the Writing Program.

Though the program managed well with two LSOEs until 2000—buttressed by the administrative roles of non-Senate faculty—the campus’s considerable growth in recent years makes the current arrangement of four LSOEs the minimum for effective leadership and administration. 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 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; and they have served on search committees for campus administrators. In such efforts, they represent the Writing Program to faculty colleagues and administrators within and beyond the campus. 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 ELWR coordinator’s duties would prohibit simultaneously chairing the program), and that personnel actions would regularly require outside faculty for completion.

Literature in composition pedagogy has, in the past decade or more, become increasingly divided between theory and practice. A divide often reified in the distinction between rhetoric (theory) and composition (practice). Unsurprisingly, this divide appears commonly in publication, with leading journals (College Composition and Communication, College English) favoring theory and smaller journals (California English, Teaching English in the Two-Year College) more often providing rationales for pedagogical techniques. UCSC’s Writing Program has since its inception managed to occupy a position between the extremes, drawing on current theory to maintain pedagogical excellence. Via the program’s next hires, we intend to maintain a program identity in which rhetoric and composition are thoroughly intertwined.

The following are replacement hires, which the Writing Program has included in its last three planning documents. All should be expert teachers and specialists in composition pedagogy. Their other specializations define their importance to the Writing Program and the campus.

In 2006-07:

- **An LSOE with expertise in applied linguistics and ESL to serve as campus ELWR coordinator.** The ELWR coordinator coordinates an operation that serves 35-40% of the annual incoming class of freshmen. The coordinator serves as a liaison between Writing Program, registrar, college advising, and Learning Support Services. Because UCSC does not have a separate track for English language learners (ELL), the ELWR
coordinator also oversees the tracking of ELL students and teaches courses that serve that growing population. Currently the ELWR coordinator is a non-Senate faculty member. An administrator of such considerable importance to the campus should be a member of the Academic Senate, which would enable full voting membership in Senate committees and a service component built into the appointment.

- **An LSOE with expertise in K-12 education; secondary specialization in disciplinary or professional writing.** The priority in this hire is to sustain the work the Writing Program has done at the intersection of university composition courses and K-12 education. Work that transformed the teaching of writing in the primary and secondary schools served by the Central California Writing Project and helped shape the teaching of writing at UCSC. 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 for this position would promote collaboration with the Education Program, as well as enabling a faculty member with real expertise to sit on key system-wide Senate committees concerned with preparation and intersegmental cooperation. A secondary specialization in disciplinary/professional writing would be desirable, especially if the campus opts to draw more systematically on the Writing Program’s resources for assisting with upper-division writing. An interest in science writing seems particularly important given the investment of campus resources in science initiatives.

**In 2009-10 (projected):**

- **An LSOE with expertise in the history, theory, and practice of rhetoric.** Though all program faculty are expected to remain current in the field, the Writing Program must have at least one specialist in rhetorical theory and composition pedagogy with Academic Senate status, someone who can speak from the history of the field that defines our work. One of the program’s two main specialists in this area retired in 2004; the other will likely retire within the next five years.

A few words about the study of rhetoric: In the beginning, there were only rhetoric and philosophy. Out of them grew literature, politics, linguistics, psychology, anthropology, sociology, and so on. Rhetoric is thus the original interdisciplinary study because it existed before the disciplines split off. After Aristotle, we see rhetoric as the art of discovering the best means of persuasion in any situation whatsoever. It is the field of inquiry that concerns itself with analyzing the nature of human discourse in all areas of knowledge and is particularly concerned with how humans try to persuade each other to make free choices. A specialist in this area will have much to provide the campus, and will be an invaluable asset in the professional development faculty in the Writing Program.

**CONCLUSION**

In 2002, immediately following the last effort at academic planning, the campus appeared to have made its decision about the role of the Writing Program at UCSC, and stood by without protest as the strongest and most financially efficient writing program in the UC system was stripped of its upper division and its longstanding role as a source for outreach efforts. But several years have passed, and the campus has had an opportunity to reflect on the real costs of those cuts. An excellent undergraduate education requires a greater investment than that required to meet the minimal requirements for competence. Whether the campus opts for a first-year writing program or for a return to a full-service program, an investment in students’ writing
beyond the first year is essential to a first-rate education. It would be a thrifty and efficient choice for the campus to make use of Writing Program resources to reach that goal.

**Minimum recommendations for a first-year Writing Program:**
- Retain hard-funded FTE (four LSOEs) so that leadership will be assured and key elements of the Writing Program’s mission anchored.
- Return to some version of a funding formula so funding will stabilize.
- Enhance the ELWR curriculum to move students through the ELWR earlier, with better editing skills, in order to prepare students more effectively to satisfy the C2 requirement and the writing expectations within their majors.
- Remove strictures of the commensurable funding formula so the resources of the Writing Program will be available to the campus.
- Work with the VP/DUE, CEP, the Coordinator of Writing in the Disciplines and Divisional Deans to make sure that provision for W courses in departments is adequate.
- Welcome initiatives from campus and system-wide units for improvements in programs for diverse students in their first four quarters.
- Continue to engage graduate students in the teaching of first-year composition through the system of mentoring which now exists or through the Workload Proposal, if it is accepted.
- Invite other departments to propose courses in professional or scholarly writing for students who want to (or should) develop their skills in these areas.

**Minimum requirements for a full-service Writing Program:**
- Retain hard-funded FTE (four LSOEs) so that leadership will be assured and so that key elements of the Writing Program’s mission will be anchored.
- Return to some version of a funding formula so funding will stabilize.
- Enhance the ELWR curriculum to move students through the ELWR earlier, with better editing skills, in order to prepare students more effectively to satisfy the C2 requirement and the writing expectations within their majors.
- Remove strictures of the commensurable funding formula so the resources of the Writing Program will be available to the campus.
- Work with the VP/DUE, CEP, the Coordinator of Writing in the Disciplines and Divisional Deans to engage writing faculty in the provision of W courses, through co-taught or other collaborative courses and through courses housed in the Writing Program.
- Welcome initiatives from campus and system-wide units for improvements in programs for diverse students, including courses for transfer students, housed in the Writing Program (now in suspension).
- Continue to engage graduate students in the teaching of first-year composition through the system of mentoring which now exists or through the Workload Proposal, if it is accepted. In addition, restore services to international graduate students as well as to graduate student writers in the Humanities.
- Reinstat courses in professional and scholarly writing housed in the Writing Program (now suspended).
REPORT ON THE WRITING PROGRAM

The current mission of the UCSC Writing Program is to provide a curriculum of writing course for undergraduates who need to fulfill their lower division writing requirements. The whole campus, not just the Humanities Division, is served by our students’ knowing how to write well. Unlike the Math Department, which also oversees a major lower-division requirement, the Writing Program is not a department and does not have a major.

Until recently the Writing Program also included in its mission the offering of courses to assist students in satisfying the “W” (writing-intensive) General Education requirement, to provide courses for students in need of work beyond Writing 1, to provide a curriculum for students wishing to do advanced work in writing, and to work closely with other faculty and programs on improving writing in disciplinary contexts.

Eschewing history and concentrating on the present, we address here only classes associated with the program’s lower-division offerings. Outlined below is a factual report on the Writing Program’s financial circumstances. We describe the work to be done and the dollars that pay for the work. We conclude by offering some interpretations on four controversial issues. We offer one recommendation about the funding model.

I. The work that needs to be accomplished by the Writing Program

A. Basic writing requirements that students need to graduate

Each fall between 3,100 and 3,200 new freshmen arrive at UCSC. This number is expected to remain reasonably constant even as the campus grows. (The planned increase in total campus enrollment is projected to come from increases in continuing students (“retention rates”), in new junior-level transfer students, and in new graduate students.) Each student has three requirements to satisfy concerning writing, known as ELWR, C, and W.

1. Entry-Level Writing Requirement (ELWR, formerly known as Subject A). All students must pass the ELWR by the end of the fourth quarter of their college career. Typically about half of UCSC students have already passed the ELWR requirements before matriculation (by passing a state-wide exam in the spring prior to matriculation: by getting a 3.4 or 5 on their AP English exam; by obtaining a high SAT score). In 2004-2005, for example, 1070 students had not already satisfied the ELWR requirement by the time Fall classes began.¹

Students who need to pass ELWR are assigned to special sections taught by trained writing instructors. The special sections are generally the same size as or smaller than regular core course sections, with 20 to 22 students per section. In Fall 2004, there were 49.5 sections serving 1070 students. (In 2003, 1270 students were served. In 2000, 1045
students were served). Students in the ELWR sections are also encouraged to sign up for ELWR tutoring concurrent with core course.²

The special sections of the college core courses and the supplemental tutoring are intended to advance student writing to the level that passes the minimum requirement (ELWR). Typically the large majority of students (around 80%) pass the ELWR by the exam given in November or by an appeal subsequent to the exam. In 2004, 78% of the students in special sections passed in November. Most of the students who did not pass were bilingual or bidialectal and would be placed in ESL tracks on many other UC campuses.

Students who do not pass ELWR in November of freshman year are subsequently directed into special writing sections: W20 (winter quarter) and W21 (spring quarter). Tutoring is available to students in these classes as well: those who paid the $69 fee in the fall are not required to pay it again. The workload credit once available to students working with tutors is no longer provided.³

One other course needs mention here. Writing 22A (for first-quarter students) and Writing 22B (for fourth-quarter and a few more advanced students) are 3-unit classes that serve students whose English language skills need additional attention. They are the only courses the Writing Program offers specifically for English language learners. Writing 22A serves as a supplement to the college core course.

During the 2001-02 academic year, 263 students took Writing Program-funded W20, W21, W22 (13 sections); class size averaged 20.2. (Only 9 students took Writing 22B in this inaugural year of the W22A/B courses.) An additional two sections of Writing 22A were funded by EOP, bringing the total number of students up to 308 and the average section size to 19.3. In 2002-03, approximately 264 students took W20, W21, W22 (in we believe, 13 sections) In 2003-04, 413 students filled 19 sections of W20, W21, and W22, with an average class size of 21.7.

2. Composition. Students must satisfy the C (Composition) requirement. Annually, a significant number of students—in fall 2002 the figure was 510—enter UCSC having placed out of the C requirement by virtue of their AP scores, or by scoring an 11 or 12 on the Writing Placement Exam. Among other students, some complete the requirement at another institution while others leave UCSC before completing the requirement. The net result is that between 2100 and 2500 students have typically taken Writing 1 per year. The recent and projected size of the entering freshmen cohort would suggest stabilization at about 2,200 students per year.⁴ In 2001-02, Writing 1 class size averaged 22.5. In 2003-04 it averaged 24.7.

3. Discipline-based writing. As part of the campus GE, students must take and pass a writing-intensive course, offered and funded by various academic departments—part of the campus GE requirements and not officially in the realm of the Writing Program.
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B. Work of the Writing Program that enables students to meet their requirements

One way to understand the Writing Program is to ask: what must it do and what must it pay for (not always the same things) so that students may meet their obligations?

The Writing Program, together with the colleges, must offer sufficient classes to help students satisfy two university and campus requirements: ELWR and composition. The Writing Program no longer offers upper division courses and thus no longer has responsibility for helping students meet the “W” requirement.

The Writing Program has several tasks to fulfill concerning ELWR. It must pay for 24 ELWR sections of college Core classes. It must select instructors for those classes in consultation with the provosts. When asked, it must also advise the colleges on the selection of instructors for the 25 or so college-funded ELWR sections.

The Writing Program must also offer enough sections of Writing 1 to meet the demand. The number of sections has varied between 88 (2002-03) and 100 (2003-04). If the documented demand exceeds the Program’s projected need for classes, then the Program applies to the Division for funds to mount additional sections. For instance, in 2003-04, a year in which there was a significant enrollment bubble, the Writing Program asked for and received funding for 14 additional sections of Writing 1 and two additional sections of Writing 20:. Nevertheless, it ended the 2002-03 year without having run seven more sections of Writing 1 that were estimated to be needed.

The Writing Program must offer enough sections of W20, W21, W22 to meet the demand. In 2002-03, the demand appears to have totaled 17 such courses; in 2003-04, there were a total of 19. EOP has helped pay for sections of Writing 22: it funded 2 of 3 such courses in 03-04 and 3 of 5 in 04-05.

The Writing Program must offer Writing 169, the course taken by undergraduates who wish to serve as writing assistants in ELWR sections of college Core classes and in Writing 20 and 21. The program annually funds two sections of Writing 169.

The Writing Program must offer Writing 203, the course taken by graduate students who wish to teach W1.

The Writing Program must pay for 2 or 3 C sections of Stevenson’s winter Core course.

In addition to offering sufficient classes to meet university and campus ELWR and composition requirements, and to offering classes that help graduate and undergraduate students participate in these efforts, the Writing Program must oversee the management of its portion of the curriculum. The Writing Program must keep track of students’ progress to meeting the ELWR; administer the liaison between colleges, Writing Program, and EOP/Learning Support Services; score the Analytical Writing Placement Exams (offered campus-wide five times annually), appeals to exam results, and writing portfolios submitted in lieu of the exam for Writing 20 and Writing 21 students; and...
judge student appeals to waive the composition requirement (among other things). The Writing Program also handles the customary business of a department, making sure that instructors are hired and reviewed, grades are recorded, individual student concerns are attended to, people are paid, and so on.

C. The new system

In spring, 2004, the Academic Senate approved a new system, designed by the Council of Provosts and the Writing Program, for covering lower-division writing. The new system, which will go into effect in the fall, 2005, modifies the old in two critical ways: First, the strongest writers, those who under the old system would have tested out of Writing 1 (C), now take a composition (C2) class, thus ensuring that even the ablest writers are instructed in college-level writing. Second, the new system also catches some of the weakest writers, those who under the old system satisfied the ELWR and C by taking community college courses of uncertain quality. Now they must take C2 before going on to their other classes, again ensuring that they have at least some college-level writing instruction in their first year.

The new system bifurcates the same enrollment by writing level, without adding new requirements or sections, and thus will be cost neutral. The new system will not necessitate the teaching of additional courses but will require that some of our courses will be re-labeled and will require that they distinguish more finely than before among levels of writing ability among the entering students. In the current system, all students take College 80 (e.g., Merrill 80, Crown 80), some sections of which are designed to help people satisfy the ELWR. In the new system, most students will take College 80A and those who have obtained high scores on the diagnostic tests (SATs, AP tests, writing placement tests) will take College 80B. In the old system most students (approximately 2300 students) took Writing 1 while those with high test scores placed out of Writing 1. In the new system, the same will occur; but now Writing 1 will be called Writing 2.

II. Resources that enable the Writing Program to meet its obligations

A. Background

The state does not fund instruction intended to allow students to pass the ELWR test because in its view such instruction is “remedial.” Whether particular courses are viewed as remedial or not is open to interpretation, but the administration of ELWR and the grading of ELWR exams make claims on the Writing Program budget that are not funded by the state] W 20. 21.22. like all Writing Program classes, generate FTE enrollments, are included by the campus in its workload counts and are therefore viewed as not remedial and appropriately funded by the state. However, because W 20. 21.22 (as well as non-instructional and remedial expenditures) are currently funded out of the same fixed budgetary allocation, it is obvious that the more costs incurred for these responsibilities, the less money there will be for W 1.
By the same token, with the shift to a static budget model, funding meant for lower-
division undergraduate instruction must now also cover the cost of Writing 203 (usually
half the cost, as it is currently co-taught by an SOE and an NSF lecturer) and of one
sections of Writing 169. Prior to the introduction of this model, these classes constituted
a line item in a budget separate from that of the lower-division writing requirements.

B. General

The annual budget for the Writing Program has been flat for at least three years (2001-02
through 2003-4). Writing Program expenditures over the last three years have ranged
from $1,640,448 in 2002-03 to $1,588,791 in 2003-04. During the same three-year
period, state allocations to the Writing Program, less start-up funding, equaled
$1,610,075 (2001-02), $1,608,466 (2002-03), and $1,622,530 (2003-04). A portion of
these funds is available to fund classes taught by lecturers. The rest is reserved for such
expenses as staff salary and benefits, lecturer benefits, Lecturer SOE salary, and
operating funds. As is true for all programs and departments in the Humanities, the
constant amount of money has to cover more line items (and more expensive items) today
than five years ago.

While funding has been flat, the method used by the campus to allocate funds to the
Division of Humanities to support the writing curriculum has changed three within the
last decade. Prior to 1996-97, the Division of Humanities received an annual block
allocation from the campus of approximately $1.7 million for TAs. These funds were
intended for three purposes: 1) fund lecturer salaries in the Language Program to mount
the language curriculum; 2) fund lecturer salaries in the Writing Program to mount the
writing curriculum; and 3) provide the division with temporary academic funds for
curricular support across the division. There was no explicit allocation for each of the
three intended uses. Beginning in 1997-98 and extending through 2001-02, lecturer
salaries (including computing and staff support, admin overhead, benefits etc.) for lower-
division campus requirements (the Writing 20 series and Writing 1) in the Writing
Program were funded directly by the campus on a formulaic basis, with total students
served, average class size, lecturer equivalencies, and the like used as formula drivers.
The Division of Humanities passed through to the Writing Program the formula-driven
dollars. In 2002-03, enrollment-based funding model was abandoned and replaced by the
decentralization of open faculty provisions, which was intended to cover funding not just
for the Writing and Language Programs but also start-ups and upgrades in the Division as
a whole.

C. 2003-2004

In 2003-04, the Writing Program received $1,622,530 in state funds to mount and support
the writing curriculum. The Writing Program received another $39,884 from non-state
sources including contributions and gifts ($33,700), Ed fees ($2,342), and work-study
($3,842). Thus, the total amount available to mount and support the writing curriculum
totaled $1,662,414. In addition to the funds to support the curriculum, the instructional
staff received $85,462 in awards from COT and from extramural sources. (By and
large. these awards are not used to support the basic writing curriculum and thus should not be factored into the analysis and are best understood as off budget.)

From 2003-04 through to the present, the program’s base curricular funding for temporary academic staff (TAS) has remained static at 12 FTE. or $620,400. TAS funds pay for classes taught by non-senate faculty (NSF), the vast majority of classes offered by the program. A decreasing series of curricular “augmentations,” $50,000 in 2003-04 and $25,000 in 2004-05, were added to this budget. (There is no projected augmentation for 2005-06.) Though the ostensible purpose of the augmentation funds was to close down the two de-funded minors, only one course from the minors, in spring 2005, was thus paid for. All other courses in the minors were paid for out of gift funds and an additional $18,000 augmentation in 2003-04. The balances of the “augmentation” funds have been used each year to fund base curricular offerings in Writing 1 and the Writing 20 series.

In 2003-04, an anomalous year because of an enrollment bubble, a total of $1.6 million in funds flowed into the writing program in the following categories:

$291,636 General State Funds--Academic salaries (LSOE)
$880,089 General State Funds-- Temporary academic salaries for writing and college Core courses (including $620,400 for salaries; $12,000 for chair replacement; $50,000 for phase-out of the journalism major; $91,200 in augmentations to Cover 16 courses added due to the enrollment bubble; $31,600 in additional Augmentations and $74,889 for buy-outs for faculty serving as provost Or on senate committees:
$ 65,976 General state Funds--Staff salaries
$254,222 General state Funds--Employee benefits (faculty, TAS, and staff)
$ 50,639 General state Funds—Supplies, phones, computing, etc.
$ 33,700 Gifts and contributions
$  2,342 Opportunity funds. Education funds
$  3,862 Work-Study funds

In addition, the program started the 2003-2004 year with $57,825 in carry-forward funds. The carry-forward funds were the result of a computational error in the Division: the Writing Program was being compensated like other departments for the salaries of graduate students teaching in the program. As the program had been told it would not receive these funds, it amassed some carry-forward.

It is important to remember that the colleges and EOP pay for some of the courses for which the Writing Program provides input concerning staffing.

III. Issues involving different points of view, interpreted through our lens

A. The issue of graduate students
At one point, the Dean of Humanities (Jorge Hankamer) set up an incentive program to encourage the Writing Program to hire graduate students as instructors of W1. The Writing Program was able then to hire graduate students for approximately $2500 per course. Then the incentive program was suspended. Currently, it costs the university about $7700 per graduate student per course. That figure includes $5611 for Teaching Fellow salary (paid by the Writing Program); $1503 for resident fees (paid by the central administration); and $504 for health insurance (paid by the central administration.) Note that this figure does not include the cost of training graduate students (through Writing 203) or mentoring them.

How does that figure compare with the compensation (salary plus benefits) of a lecturer? The answer, of course, depends on the salary paid to lecturers. The median salary of lecturers is $48,450. To this one needs to add benefits, derived through the formula in which salary is multiplied by 13.5% and the figure of $6,700 is added to the sum. Thus, to a salary of $48,450, one would add $13,240 for a total compensation of $61,691. That figure is presumed to cover 8 courses so that each course taught by “the average lecturer” costs $7711 – essentially the same the direct cost of a graduate student (excluding Writing 203 and mentoring costs).

B. The issue of adequacy of resources

With a budget of $1.6M can the Writing Program meet all its obligations? While different funding streams come to the Writing Program, some of the streams have fences around them and some do not. Thus, for ease of calculation, one can assign reasonable costs to each of the obligations and see if the costs can be covered by $1.6M.

One way to conduct the calculations makes the amount of $1.6M seem not only reasonable but also comfortable. We can start by assuming that the number of courses to be offered per year is somewhere between 137-145 (24 college courses: plus 90 Writing 1; plus 18 Writing 20-22: plus 2 courses of Writing 169; plus 1 course of Writing 203: plus 2 courses chair buy out). We then take $7700 as the average per course cost. The total cost of 137 courses at $7700 comes to $1.054,900. The total costs of 145 courses at $7700 comes to $1,116,500. Naturally, other expenses must be covered, including compensation for support staff (which might be estimated at $85,000 for staff salaries and benefits and for work-study help) supplies (which might be estimated at $50,000). and also the payment of equivalencies.

Seen from the point of view of those within the Writing Program, however, the budget looks overly constrained. Members of the Writing Program are aware of serious warning signals. First, in 2003-04, only a small portion of the augmentation meant to help ease out the journalism minor was actually used for that purpose. The bulk of the money was used to deliver the core curriculum. Second, although the salaries of the 4 Lecturers with Security of Employment (LSOE) swell the budget. LSOEs together can teach only 24 courses. Third, enrollments have been at the permissible maximums. and it seems that there may be a large “float” of students who will --sooner rather than later--need to enroll in Writing 1. In spring 2005 the Writing Program filled its classes before 150-170
students who had just cleared the ELWR had a chance to enroll in Writing 1. (These are among the weakest writers on campus.) Finally, the regulations accompanying the new C1/C2 system indicate that students must satisfy C2 (a requirement met mainly by Writing 1, which will be renamed Writing 2) by the time they begin their seventh quarter. Given that there are about 700 students who have not completed Writing 1 by the end of the fifth term, there may be a logjam ahead.\textsuperscript{5} The severity of the logjam depends, ironically, on student attrition. If attrition rates continue at their current rates of 10% a year, then the problem is not particularly great; but efforts are being made to lower attrition rates.

CPB feels that differences concerning the adequacy of resources can only be resolved with data that tracks students—noting, for instance, how, when, and where they satisfy their writing requirements. At present, Institutional Research does not track students or courses in a way that allows for the best planning at the campus level (as opposed to providing data for the purposes of the Office of the President)

CPB worries about the negative consequences of the present practice of funding at a minimum level and then augmenting when a great need is manifest. Such a system places a great strain on the chair of the Writing Program and creates uncertainty for loyal lecturers. It may also compromise the education of students who may be saddled with “last minute” hires.

At the same time, CPB recognizes the difficulty of finding a good solution. The real source of the problem may lie in the inherent uncertainties that plague the enterprise of testing students and placing them in courses at the beginning of the Fall. Given the class sizes of 25 or fewer students, if 50 students more than expected fail to pass one of the writing exams, it may be necessary to mount two extra courses.

\textit{C. Funding Model}

The funding model has undergone many changes. It may be prudent therefore to keep things as they are. It may also make sense to revert to a prior model: the enrollment model. Yet, in light of the special circumstances of the Writing Program, the best model is one that assures both flexibility and predictability. At present, the Writing Program depends on augmentations from the Humanities Division when enrollments balloon beyond reasonable expectations. Might we not gain in simplicity, predictability, and equity to use an enrollment-based formula for funding the program?

\textit{D. Funding Sources and Funding Streams}

EOP pays for some sections of Writing 20, 21, and 22. Might it not be a good idea to expect EOP to pay for all sections of Writing 10, 21, and 22?

Funding for the Writing Program flows through the Humanities Division. When Humanities needs to make severe cuts, it may think to capture savings by cutting TAS, a move that has especially severe consequences for the Writing Program. When times are
less constrained economically, in contrast, there is little incentive for Humanities to lavish resources on the Writing Program, especially in an era when the campus is seeking to expand its graduate programs relative to undergraduate programs. Presumably, at the undergraduate level, the Writing Program provides the greatest services to those who are not likely to major in the Humanities.

Is CPB suggesting then that the Writing Program be funded directly from the center and not through the Humanities conduit? No. Right now, no one seems to be asking for such a change. The Division seems willing to provide the accounting services needed. But, recognition of the mismatch between the needs of the Humanities Division and the needs of the Writing Program lend weight to the idea that a strict enrollment-based funding model might be a good safeguard against potential conflicts in the future.

E. Commensurable Funding

The Writing Program has a long history of innovative and highly successful collaborations with other units. For example, senior members of the Writing Program have co-taught W courses in the disciplines and have worked with graduate students in various departments. Now, however, the funding model imposes restrictions so that SOE lecturers cannot unit in other units without risking bankruptcy for either the host units or the Writing Program. Under a chancellor who has made inter-disciplinarity and inter-divisional inter-disciplinarity one of her explicit goals, it seems unnecessarily restrictive to have a funding policy that essentially keeps the Writing Program's most experienced instructors on a short leash. CPB urges the administration to re-consider the funding model and to make it more flexible.
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1 Some 330 students placed out, mostly through local placement.
2 This service, once required of all Subject A students and funded by the Writing Program, was formerly linked to a 2-unit workload credit tutorial, but now costs students $69 apiece and no longer provides enrollment credit. Some students who sign up for the tutorials have the tutorial fee paid by EOP. In the first year of fee-for-tutoring (2003-04), the colleges paid the fees for some low-income students; in the second year, the Writing Program elected to pay those fees but in the near future (2006) they will no longer have the special funding it is using to do so.
3 Note: the “credit” associated with tutoring was workload credit only. It could not be applied to the degree; it was counted for measurement of academic standing and financial
aid purposes. Planning and Budget did an analysis that suggested that the removal of such credit had minimal, if any, impact on students. Of the ~1200 students evaluated for 2003-04, 10-15 might have fallen below minimum progress if the credit for the tutorials had not been available. Minimum progress measures only the number of units students accumulate, however. The workload credit enabled under-prepared students to take two main classes, and ELWR section of Core in which they concentrated on writing and academic discourse, and another, possibly also including a for-credit lab. There has as yet been no study measuring the academic effect of the loss of workload credit on the campus’s most at-risk students.

4 The effect of enhanced selectivity in admissions has not yet been determined; but the high standards for exemption probably mean that the figure of 2200 will remain realistic for some years to come.

5 A study by institutional research showed that 63% of an entering class had taken writing 1 by the end of the winter of sophomore year. Thus about 1950 or so students took writing 1 by the end of the fifth quarter. Add to this the figure of 500 or so students who placed out of Writing 1, and the resultant is 2450. 3100 minus 2450 is 650. 3200 minus 2450 is 750. Thus we arrive at the figure of 700.