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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 writer. 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 might 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 advertises 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 insure 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.
- Reinstate courses in professional and scholarly writing housed in the Writing Program (now suspended).