



University of Colorado **Boulder**

2016 Program Review

Program for Writing and Rhetoric

Academic Review and Planning  
Advisory Committee Report

Approved

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul Noel".

03/17/17

Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs : Date

# Contents

Process Overview – 3

2016 ARPAC Members – 4

Unit Overview – 5

Past Reviews – 12

Campus Context – 13

National Context – 14

Analysis – 15

Recommendations – 23

Required Follow-Up – 27

## Process Overview

The review of the Program for Writing and Rhetoric (PWR) was conducted in accordance with the 2016 review guidelines. The Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC) conducts and writes the final reviews of all academic units on the Boulder campus. The unit prepared a self-study, which was reviewed by an internal review committee (IRC) of two faculty members from outside of PWR. The IRC generally found the report fair and accurate. An external review committee (ERC), consisting of two experts within the discipline from outside of the University of Colorado, visited the unit on March 17 and 18, 2016, reviewed the relevant documents, and met with faculty, students, staff, university administrators, and members of ARPAC. The reviewers' comments and recommendations are cited at appropriate points throughout the report. This public document reflects the assessment of and recommendations for PWR as approved by ARPAC.

Academic Review  
and Planning  
Advisory  
Committee  
(ARPAC)

Marie Banich, Professor, Institute of Cognitive Science  
Sanjai Bhagat, Professor, Leeds School of Business  
Adam Bradley, Associate Professor, Department of English  
Erin Furtak, Associate Professor, School of Education  
David Korevaar, Professor, College of Music  
Clayton Lewis, Professor, Department of Computer Science  
Jack Maness, Associate Professor, University Libraries  
David Mapel, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science  
Susan Nevelow Mart, Associate Professor, School of Law  
Bryan Taylor, Professor, Department of Communication

Academic year 2016-2017  
voting members

Non-voting members

Jeff Cox, ARPAC Chair, Vice Provost and Associate Vice  
Chancellor for Faculty Affairs and Professor of English and  
Humanities  
Bob Boswell, Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Community  
Engagement and Professor of Molecular, Cellular, and  
Developmental Biology  
Katherine Eggert, Quality Initiative Leader and Professor of English  
Bill Kaempfer, Senior Vice Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor  
for Budget and Planning and Professor of Economics  
Mary Kraus, Vice Provost and Associate Vice Chancellor for  
Undergraduate Education and Professor of Geological Sciences  
Ann Schmiesing, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School  
and Professor of Germanic & Slavic Languages & Literatures

Staff

Andre Grothe, Office of Faculty Affairs

## Unit Overview

The campus' standardized description of the Program for Writing and Rhetoric (PWR), and information regarding comparable units, can be found on the Office of Data Analytics' (ODA) website (<http://www.colorado.edu/oda/institutional-research/institutional-level-data/information-department/academic-review-and-0>). ODA updates the profile annually in the fall semester. This report cites the ODA data for PWR posted October 8, 2015; these figures reflect the state of the unit in academic year (AY) 2014-2015. Given the size of the program and year-to-year fluctuations in enrollment and personnel, this report relies largely on the more recent information provided in the PWR's self-study, updated on February 24, 2016.

The Program for Writing and Rhetoric was established in 2001, evolving from the University Writing Program with the goal of centralizing and better organizing undergraduate writing instruction. The external reviewers observed that “the PWR is functioning with strength and success.” PWR delivers its courses efficiently, and the faculty and staff function well together. As the ERC puts it, “Operationally, the PWR seems quite successful in creating a working environment and a cooperative spirit that encourages community, connection, and collaboration in carrying out the program's goals and responsibilities.” Today, the program generates the seventh largest number of student credit hours (SCH) on the CU Boulder campus (22,688 in AY 2014-2015) and the largest number in the division of arts and humanities. But success has come with growing pains, especially after significant recession-related cuts in 2008-2009, including a \$600,000 continuing budget reduction and a significant drawdown in instructors. In spite of increasing enrollments—filling 200 to 210 sections a year, capped at 19 students—the program has not yet returned to its pre-recession staffing level. With only six tenured and tenure-track (TTT) faculty (from self-study; ODA reported four

TTT for 2014-2015), and all jointly appointed in other areas, the large majority of PWR classes are taught by a cadre of lecturers, graduate assistants, and instructors.

#### Personnel and governance

A director runs the Program for Writing and Rhetoric, serving for a renewable four-year term and reporting to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S). There are also nine associate directors, four coordinators, and assorted others drawn from teaching faculty who administer program components. Program bylaws establish three organizational areas: the Writing Center, the First-Year Program, and upper-division classes. The assigned and compensated administrative duties of associate PWR directors include oversight of information literacy, conflict resolution, continuing education, international student services, two separate residential academic programs (RAPs), service learning and outreach, graduate studies, assessment, professional development, digital composition, and the Writing Across the Curriculum/Writing in the Discipline program (WAC/WID). According to the bylaws, a PWR faculty committee evaluates the performance of associate directors on a four-year schedule. While faculty governance appears to conform with campus standards and procedures, including for mentorship, reappointment, and review procedures, the number of associate directors exceeds the cap of three allowed under college policies.

There are 97 teaching employees, consisting of the six aforementioned TTT (one professor, three associate professors, two assistant professors), 23 senior instructors, 19 instructors, 30 lecturers, four teaching assistants (TAs), and 15 graduate part-time instructors (GPTIs). Four classified staff positions and three student hourly workers provide program support.

The Program for Writing and Rhetoric includes a mandatory mentoring program for teaching faculty, including reciprocal classroom observations, syllabi review, and professional development courses.

Three of the classified staff work full-time supporting the main office. Two of these—an Administrative Assistant II and an Administrative Assistant III—address student advising and registration as well as help faculty. The third full-time staff (currently classified as General Professional III) is the program administrator. A part-time employee (0.75) works at the Norlin Writing Center.

The self-study observes, “In the 2014-15 academic year, the PWR was the highest SCH generator in the Division of Arts and Humanities and the seventh highest SCH generator on campus. However, our staff numbers are among the lowest of the high SCH-generating units, and our NTT [non-tenure track] faculty numbers are the highest—in fact, they are three times as high as the unit with the next highest number of NTT faculty.”

Research, scholarship, and creative work

The six TTT PWR faculty are active researchers, but joint appointments lessen the likelihood that their contributions to the program will add up to a distinct portfolio of writing and rhetoric-focused scholarship. In light of CU Boulder faculty strengths, and the growing significance of expository and rhetorical research, this represents a missed opportunity. As a first step in addressing this deficit, and as a vehicle to provide the program with a research profile, PWR intends to establish a center, the Writing, Rhetoric, Information Technology, and Ecology Laboratory (WRITE Lab).

The program hopes that the WRITE Lab will draw on the considerable strengths of PWR instructors. While they do not have

a research component to their appointments, the self-study observes that 80 percent are actively writing and publishing. The lab could provide an avenue for their professional interests and for collaborations between instructors and TTT faculty, further raising the university's scholarly profile.

#### Undergraduate education

Ninety percent of undergraduate students at CU Boulder are required to take a writing class in their first year, although by PWR's own reporting only 54 percent do. The reasons for the difference are hard to pin down, as the IRC report's query on that topic and the unit's reply make evident. Reasons as varied as budgeting, faulty advising (which results in students taking first-year writing courses as sophomores), and substitute course work might play a role. PWR also provides upper-division writing courses aimed at helping students with writing skills for major-related work or as career preparation. In addition to these traditional instructional programs, PWR oversees a small constellation of help centers, headquartered at Norlin Library and formally called the Writing Center. This operation serves undergraduate students primarily—about 75 percent of visits—but also a broader constituency. The Writing Center is in the sixth year of running a peer-tutoring program in which undergraduate student interns are mentored for six weeks to make them eligible to apply for paid tutoring positions in the Academic Support and Achievement Program of Housing and Dining Services.

As mentioned above, PWR offers between 200 and 210 sections per semester capped at 19 students per class. A number of these courses are offered through the residential academic programs (numbering 10 A&S RAPs and the Leeds Business RAP).

As a longer-term goal, PWR proposes to establish an undergraduate major in rhetoric and composition. PWR identifies



the major as one of its “highest priorities for the next review cycle.”  
The possible major is currently the focus of a faculty study.

The program has also undertaken a campus-wide initiative called Writing Across the Curriculum/Writing in the Disciplines (WAC/WID). The initiative intends to develop collaborative courses with units that already offer area-specific writing instruction. According to the self-study, PWR has “expertise, not in all disciplines, but across an array of writing practices that should prepare the PWR to assist departments to improve their [...] courses, just as exposure to other departments may well enrich the offerings within our curriculum.”

#### Graduate education

While the bulk of the program’s teaching is aimed at undergraduate students, PWR offers a 5000-level writing instruction course designed to train GPTIs to teach the PWR curriculum. PWR-trained GPTIs teach undergraduates on two-year appointments. Both IRC and ERC reports find high levels of satisfaction among PWR GPTIs, both for what they learn and for the teaching experience they gain.

#### Budget

PWR has justifiable complaints about the stability of its budget. A sizable proportion of program funding comes from variable College of Arts and Sciences leaves and replacements dollars. Further, because of fluctuations in the number of entering undergraduates, and a failure to report accurately incoming enrollments, program staff have had difficulty ascertaining the optimal teaching appropriation in any given academic year. The uncertainties of budgeting from non-continuing funding also negatively impacts morale, training and professional development, and the consistency of teaching quality, particularly for the 1000-level classes. PWR is obliged to place lecturers on one-semester

contracts, and there is no provision in the budget for training new hires—a task staff largely takes on.

Nor is the Writing Center's budget drawn from a pool of stable, continuing funds. Rather, it is based on contributions from multiple sources, including the College of Arts and Sciences, the Division of Housing and Dining Services, the Graduate School, and the provost's office. In addition, the self-study notes that the current budget is insufficient to serve adequately the large number of international students using the Writing Center. With international enrollments growing, PWR has added English as a second language (ESL) sections among its first-year offerings, totaling 12 sections in fall 2015.

Space PWR has 93 faculty dispersed across five locations. The self-study identifies limited and geographically scattered space as a detriment to curricular cohesion, student access to faculty, and faculty collegiality and support.

PWR instructors routinely share office space in open cubicles, and this negatively impacts privacy for student consultations. In addition, the program lacks dedicated classroom space and, for the most part, has difficulty finding teaching spaces during peak hours, 10:00am and 3:00pm, times heavily targeted by students.

Inclusive excellence PWR has made diversity a core instructional initiative and a program planning focus. Documented achievements include a number of campus diversity awards. PWR programs include an annual diversity conference showcasing student writing and a student diversity writing award. The program also makes diversity-related topics an emphasis of introductory writing courses.

The program is a principle focus for non-native English speakers enrolled at CU Boulder, including through English as a second language (ESL) courses. The PWR self-study says that the Writing Center helped about 400 international students in 2014.

Significantly, PWR has outreach through service learning and civic engagement, partnering with the Boulder Homeless Shelter, Intercambio de Comunidades, and the African Community Center, among others. CU Boulder's Institute for Ethical and Civic Engagement considers PWR a model.

In spite of the program's commitment to diversity in the areas of curriculum and outreach, the current rostered faculty includes only four persons of color (less than 10 percent of PWR instructors). The unit acknowledges that this total is too low. Fifty percent of the faculty are female.

## Past Reviews

Many of the issues raised in the 2016 self-study reflect both accomplishments and ideas raised in the largely laudatory and supportive 2009 ARPAC report. Significant changes since the last review include an increase in the number of graduate student teachers and a shift in the non-TTT faculty cohort from instructor-level appointments to shorter-term lecturer appointments. The change was partly a consequence of budget cuts during the intervening economic downturn. With increasing enrollments, the problems of TTT versus non-TTT faculty and of the balance of instructors, lecturers, and graduate students in the teaching faculty remain largely unresolved, although PWR is pleased to acknowledge a positive trend in the last academic year: the hiring of two new TTT faculty.

PWR successfully established an undergraduate mentoring program—an idea endorsed in the 2009 review report. PWR has not yet formed a campus-wide advisory board following ARPAC's endorsement of the idea in 2009. Notably, in 2009 ARPAC did not endorse the program's ambition to establish a graduate degree in writing and rhetoric. In the current round of review documents, PWR advocates for the possibility of establishing an undergraduate major. The program again lists the advantages to CU Boulder of establishing writing and rhetoric as a full-fledged research focus. As it did in 2009, PWR cites the National Research Council description of the field as an “emerging discipline.”

## Campus Context

The Program for Writing and Rhetoric is a non-departmental unit that generates more credit-hours than almost any other CU Boulder group. As such, it seems to be a remarkable success story, in spite of its lack of department status. The six PWR-affiliated TTT faculty are rostered in either the departments of Communication or English. This group has active commitments to many other units, including Ethnic Studies, the Honors Program, the Center for the Study of the American West, and Women and Gender Studies, and with the College of Media, Communication and Information. The low proportion of TTT faculty has made it more difficult for PWR to deliver a consistent level of teaching and to keep a handle on the curriculum. In spite of these obstacles, the external reviewers noted high morale among the teaching faculty and among staff. The internal reviewers expressed some concerns about the morale of lecturers due to the question of how contracts are timed.

The 2016 self-study, like its 2009 predecessor, links the PWR curriculum to a number of Flagship 2030 goals, including an emphasis on experiential education (training for graduate teachers as well as for undergraduate mentors) and education in the residence halls. PWR is demonstrably strong in the areas of outreach and diversity, for which it has been repeatedly recognized. The self-study notes that despite the program's campus-wide scope, it reports only to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

## National Context

The self-study lays out plans to align CU Boulder more closely with peer institutions that credential students in writing and rhetoric. The WRITE lab proposal envisions an incubator for rhetoric-related research at CU Boulder. In addition, the lab could serve as a focus for funding from granting organizations. The self-study cites the National Research Council as well as programs at Auburn, MIT, Syracuse, Purdue, and UT Austin to support the lab plan. The proposal also carries forward ambitions first articulated during the 2009 review, with the important difference that PWR intends to make an undergraduate degree, not a graduate degree, the aim.

The ERC supports these initiatives and recommends the implementation of the research lab. However, the ERC report does make these recommendations contingent on the unit revisiting its strategic plan to account better for the current state of curricula nationally and to define better its Boulder campus role and mission.

## Analysis

In the 15 years since the program's start, PWR personnel have demonstrated a model commitment to undergraduate education, including a record of curricular innovation, and a dedication to improving the student first-year experience through small class size. The program has also prioritized fostering connections to undergraduate academic degree programs and takes to heart the need for good faculty mentoring and inclusive excellence. However, this period of progress has seen many obstacles, not least budget fluctuations that resulted in uncertainty. To some extent, morale issues attached to this uncertainty and the 2016 IRC report cited past budget cuts as a continuing frustration. But ARPAC agrees with PWR in its response to the IRC that it is probably time to move beyond these issues, especially as the ERC report finds no unusual cause for concern in terms of morale.

If the campus sees PWR as central to the undergraduate curriculum, then it will need to support the program academically and stabilize the unit's budget. As is, program personnel feel unduly burdened and program facilities are oversubscribed. Future program success will require more help, and this will require more money. If the intriguing planning work outlined in the PWR self-study is an indication of future potential, increased investments will prove both reasonable and wise.

### Personnel and governance

The primary mission of the Program for Writing and Rhetoric is to provide required writing classes to incoming undergraduates. While these courses are intended for first-year students, the exigencies of advising and the needs of individual students lead to enrollment unpredictability. As a result, many sections are staffed on what appears to be essentially an ad hoc basis: numerous lecturers are hired for short-term appointments, while a smaller cadre of rostered instructors and senior instructors and a core of (now) six TTT faculty rostered in related departments (PWR does not control any TTT faculty lines) have longer-term appointments.

(Note that even the graduate student instructors have two-year appointments and a more structured mentoring system than the lecturers.) While some flexibility is necessary, the current set-up leads to high overheads in terms of training for what appears to be a rather fluid body of teaching faculty with obvious implications for curricular coherence and instructional consistency. In order to stabilize this situation, the IRC and ERC support the program's justifiable request to re-balance the faculty cohort away from a high proportion of lecturers and toward more TTT faculty and instructors. ARPAC emphasizes that new TTT lines should support the program's intellectual and academic mission and improve student outcomes.

The ERC in particular offers a balanced and specific assessment of needed faculty numbers going forward, suggesting "8-10 tenure-line faculty; 45 full-time instructors; 15-25 graduate students [GPTIs]; and 12-15 adjuncts [lecturers]." These recommendations are in line with the unit's own assessment and requests. This represents a modest increase from current instructor and TTT numbers.

The self-study also asks consideration for the Program for Writing and Rhetoric to roster TTT lines directly. This raises a subject of a larger conversation around the strengths of being a "program" rather than a "department." Given the broad, campus-wide reach of PWR, ARPAC feels that the current arrangement is a potential strength, rather than a liability, encouraging precisely the diversity of disciplines and research interests of PWR's current TTT affiliates.

The ERC also reports that instructors have expressed a desire to gain Writing Center assignments, as this would to some extent alleviate their heavy teaching requirements (four classes per



semester). ARPAC hopes that the rebalancing of teaching faculty away from the heavy reliance on lecturer positions could allow PWR the flexibility to consider using instructors in the Writing Center on a rotating basis as part of their teaching load.

The IRC report also raises the question of whether some instructors might be offered lower, 50 percent appointments (at their request) as a way of leaving some headroom in teaching loads and alleviating the need for some of the shorter-term hires.

ARPAC is concerned that the current administrative structure is overly dependent upon using teaching faculty in positions that might be better handled by staff. The creation of large numbers of associate director and coordinator positions has reduced the number of teaching hours available for teaching faculty, especially instructors. PWR should consider crafting a request for further staff lines (beyond the one FTE mentioned in the self-study) to lessen the administrative load on teaching faculty.

In addition, there needs to be a plan for succession in the directorship. The college and PWR might consider a different model from the current one, which is dependent upon finding a willing and qualified candidate from among TTT faculty who are affiliated with the program. Possibilities could include a co-directorship between a TTT faculty member and a senior instructor or recruiting a director from outside the program.

As noted in the self-study, the Program for Writing and Rhetoric has a coherent and well-organized mentoring program. However, a great deal of staff time, of necessity, is devoted to training new faculty. ARPAC hopes that a long-term solution to this issue, including the rebalancing of faculty numbers toward instructors and TTT faculty, can be reached. The ERC lauds the unit for the

high morale of teaching faculty, who feel well-supported in spite of both the unit's large size and the fact that it does not have a single campus location—good evidence for the efficacy of the program's commitment to a comprehensive faculty mentoring program. Given problems cited by earlier reviews, the ERC's conclusions are heartening.

The IRC further supports the idea that rebalancing the faculty by increasing instructors and TTT faculty and reducing lecturers “could have a number of ripple effects [ . . . ]. In interviews, we were told that it would not only enhance instruction but also support staff and improve the efficacy of program planning and innovations.”

The ERC adds a suggestion to “make more transparent what specific systems of support, mentorship, or professional development opportunities enable each category of faculty to perform at or above the level of expectations.”

At its last review, in 2009, ARPAC recommended that the Program for Writing and Rhetoric reconstitute a campus-wide advisory board. Both the IRC and ERC reports emphasize the usefulness of such a board, which has (apparently) not yet been established. As the ERC writes, “Typically, such boards include representatives from major collegiate units as well as support units [ . . . ]. In this way, important curricular issues concerning writing instruction are spread across campus, and faculty or administrators become fully informed about the specifics of the writing program.” ARPAC once again urges PWR to work together with the College of Arts and Sciences and the other colleges to (re)constitute such a board in the immediate future to help with issues of curricular transparency, relations with other units, faculty perceptions, and so on.

Research, scholarship, and creative work

The Program for Writing and Rhetoric has lacked opportunities to form a research focus. To date, PWR is principally recognized for its delivery of undergraduate courses. ARPAC finds compelling the program's vision for developing a research center, the WRITE Lab (the Writing, Rhetoric, Information Technology, and Ecology Laboratory). PWR envisions the WRITE Lab as an incubator for research agendas touching on rhetoric and composition. The WRITE Lab especially holds promise to energize cross-disciplinary research. Indeed, should the program succeed in establishing the WRITE Lab, faculty from all fields should be invited to join. The lab could represent an opportunity for PWR affiliates to connect on research spanning many interests in rhetoric and composition and involve CU Boulder faculty from all colleges and schools.

Undergraduate and graduate education and support

The Program for Writing and Rhetoric self-study establishes the development of a rhetoric and composition undergraduate degree program and an expansion of collaborations via the Writing Across the Curriculum/Writing in the Disciplines (WAC/WID) rubric as major curricular initiatives. The external reviewers were especially enthusiastic in support of the latter project, which could lead to a more effective cross-disciplinary writing pedagogy. While ARPAC believes both of these efforts are worthy of consideration, PWR should prioritize the development of WAC/WID offerings. To this end, ARPAC concurs with the ERC's suggestion that a proposal for a future senior faculty hire be aimed at increasing expertise in WAC/WID and its scholarly basis.

The program must work to address questions raised with the disciplinary units regarding the applicability and effectiveness of writing courses, both to answer the demand for general instruction and to address the need for discipline-specific writing skills. In defining a way forward, PWR should propose how WAC/WID

could help to bridge current collaboration and communication gaps.

In addition, the ERC stresses the need for the program to communicate with units about the content of the first-year writing courses and how best to develop a first-year writing experience with broad cross-disciplinary buy-in. It must be acknowledged that the program's contributions to writing instruction do not lessen faculty's responsibility in other units to continue to emphasize their students' development of writing skills as they continue through their undergraduate years. Some specific suggestions from the ERC bear repeating here: a stronger online presence, PWR faculty visits to department meetings, "the creation and publication of a common lexicon of 'threshold writing concepts' for use by all faculty across the campus," and more collaborations across campus "to help the PWR to demonstrate what it is contributing to students' written literacy and what it can't contribute—what must come from faculty across the curriculum and especially in the major."

The program is aware that the first-year writing classes have been criticized for lacking curricular transparency. It seems reasonable for course listings to include topic subtitles so students can choose those of interest. Meanwhile, the program would like to reduce section enrollments to 15 (from 19) as a way to improve outcomes through greater individual attention. Of course, such a change would require increased numbers of teaching faculty. While pedagogically defensible, this idea clearly would have to be considered in terms of campus-wide budgeting needs.

The use of undergraduate peer-tutors in the Writing Center is an excellent example of the experiential teaching model and should be encouraged. In addition, the establishment of Writing Center

satellites in the residential academic programs shows promise to improve retention and student success.

Also, ARPAC sees the program's exploration of online courses as a promising pursuit; the demand for these classes can only be expected to grow. The current formula, which proportions 10 percent of courses as online, seems like a good start. Before further expansion, it will be important to get a sense of the success of online instruction relative to in-person teaching. The self-study indicates a judicious approach is already being taken.

While the Program for Writing and Rhetoric mainly focuses on the delivery of undergraduate writing courses, it offers a graduate-level writing pedagogy course aimed at training its group of graduate student instructors. In addition, the Writing Center serves a large number of graduate students, many of whom are international students with English as their second language.

The program's request for additional GPTI lines is worth consideration and would appear to be a good investment of resources.

Budget As observed in the self-study, the program's budget declined by \$600,000 between 2009 and 2011. The recovery process from that cut continues. Given the program's importance to the undergraduate curriculum, ARPAC would like to see more funding restored to PWR, especially as enrollments continue to rise and the demand for PWR classes grows.

Space PWR suffers a space problem. The program would like more accommodation for classes at prime teaching hours. PWR faculty lack offices with sufficient space or privacy. Moreover, the unit is dispersed across six locations. ARPAC hopes that campus and

PWR leaders can seize opportunities for centralizing PWR operations and for providing offices better suited to mentoring students. Also, given how many credit hours PWR generates, the program's request for dedicated classroom space should be given serious consideration.

Inclusive excellence

PWR sees a broader cross-section of undergraduate students than any other campus unit. The program takes its commitment to diversity seriously, from hiring practices to curricular development. ARPAC looks forward to PWR continuing with its exciting and recognized inclusivity and outreach work. The program's leaders are to be lauded for their attention to these pursuits, especially as a focus of undergraduate education.

Assuming that resources are provided for further hiring, it would be incumbent upon PWR to follow through on its plans to attract diverse candidates and to be proactive about increasing the representativeness of the teaching faculty.

ARPAC is impressed by the PWR service-learning agenda. These commitments support the program's connections to diverse communities. ARPAC wants to see these obligations expanded, especially as they open opportunities for outside funding. But the committee also recognizes how strained current commitments already make PWR TTT faculty and staff.

# Recommendations

The members of the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC) address the following recommendations to the Program for Writing and Rhetoric, the deans, and the provost. It is the committee's intention that the recommendations serve to benefit program improvement and development and to further the mission of the University of Colorado Boulder.

## To the unit

1. Work together with the colleges and the provost's office to rebalance the proportions of TTT, instructors, and lecturers so that the number of teaching faculty on short-term contracts (lecturers) is reduced to the minimum needed to ensure year-to-year flexibility;
  - a. Ascertain the appropriate level of staffing to ensure that faculty training, student advising, and administration are all adequately supported. Contingent on reducing the number of associate chairs and other administrative positions, consider increasing staff numbers by at least two FTE. PWR needs to reduce the number of teaching faculty involved in administrative duties. Rebalancing administrative loads should free up faculty to do more teaching;
  - b. Craft a plan to shift teaching responsibilities from lecturers to TTT faculty, instructors, and GPTIs;
  - c. As the program shifts teaching responsibilities away from lecturers, PWR should consider employing more instructors in the Writing Center;
2. Put in place a plan to encourage a diverse pool of applicants for open positions, and make every effort to increase the

diversity of backgrounds represented by teaching faculty in particular;

3. Expand inter-unit collaborations toward WAC/WID. This should be an inclusive process; ARPAC encourages consideration of the needs not only of units in the College of Arts and Sciences but in all of the colleges on the CU Boulder campus, as writing is intrinsic to all students' endeavors. Explore possible funding models for WAC/WID;
4. Postpone consideration of an undergraduate major until a viable WAC/WID program is in place;
5. Develop the proposed WRITE Lab with an eye to cross-disciplinary work that goes beyond the boundaries of PWR and includes other units. Explore options for external funding;
6. Work with the college dean and the senior vice provost to explore possibilities for consolidating faculty and administrative offices;
7. Work with the college and the provost's office to find appropriate funding sources to stabilize the Writing Center budget;
8. Increase efforts to communicate directly with other units about the writing curriculum by forming a campus-wide faculty advisory board. Strive to increase curricular transparency in order to encourage understanding of what PWR can do for undergraduate writing and what individual units around campus will need to do;



9. Consider the best ways to manage succession planning for the director of PWR. This might include creating a co-directorship between a tenured faculty member and a senior instructor or recruiting a leader from outside PWR.

To the dean of the College  
of Arts and Sciences

10. Work with PWR, the deans of the other colleges, and the provost's office to ascertain appropriate faculty levels and ways of funding new positions as required. Consider proposals from PWR to shift teaching responsibilities from lecturers to TTT faculty, instructors, and GPTIs;

11. Work with PWR and the provost's office on facilities issues;

12. Work with PWR and the provost's office to stabilize the Writing Center budget;

13. Work with PWR to manage succession planning for the program directorship.

To all deans and vice-  
provost of Undergraduate  
Education

14. Work with PWR on the development of WAC/WID curricula campus-wide;

15. Work with PWR to find possible GPTIs to supplement their current numbers.

To the provost

16. Work with PWR and the College of Arts and Sciences on facilities issues as outlined above;

17. Work with PWR and the College of Arts and Sciences on a plan to stabilize the Writing Center budget.

To the Office of University  
Advancement

18. Work with PWR to identify outside funding sources for such possibilities as an endowed professorship in the Department of English to increase expertise in WAC/WID and potential support for the Writing Center.

To the provost and the  
chancellor

19. Work with PWR to create a communication channel with the Office of Admissions so that earlier predictions of student numbers for first-year writing courses can be made.

## Required Follow-Up

The director of the Program for Writing and Rhetoric shall report annually on the first of April for a period of three years following the year of the receipt of this report (i.e., April 1st of 2018, 2019, and 2020) to the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and to the provost on the implementation of these recommendations.

Likewise, the dean shall report annually on the first of May to the provost on the implementation of recommendations addressed to the college. The provost, as part of the review reforms, has agreed to respond annually to all outstanding matters under her/his purview arising from this review year. All official responses will be posted online.