

## Brothers, Sheila C

---

**From:** Grzegorz Wasilkowski [greg@cs.uky.edu]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 26, 2013 1:42 PM  
**To:** Blonder, Lee  
**Cc:** Brothers, Sheila C; Grzegorz Wasilkowski  
**Subject:** Department of WRD

This is a recommendation from Senate Advisory Organization and Structure Committee that the University Senate endorse the formation of the Department of Writing, Rhetoric and Digital Studies in the College of Arts and Sciences.

G. W. Wasilkowski

=====  
Grzegorz (Greg) W. Wasilkowski      [greg@cs.uky.edu](mailto:greg@cs.uky.edu)  
Department of Computer Science      <http://www.cs.uky.edu/~greg/>  
301 Davis Marksbury Building      office:      859-257-8029  
University of Kentucky      department: 859-257-3961  
Lexington, KY 40506-0633      fax:      859-257-1505  
=====



Office of the Provost  
105 Main Building  
Lexington, KY 40506-0032  
859 257-2911  
fax 859 257-1333  
www.uky.edu

October 10, 2013

Dr. Lee X. Blonder  
Chair, University Senate Council  
201 Main Building  
CAMPUS 0032

Dear Lee:

The College of Arts and Sciences proposes to establish a Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies. The faculty of the current Division of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies (WRD) are currently a semi-autonomous unit in the Department of English.

The attached proposal presents a compelling argument. The College has played a key role in consolidating the writing units now housed in WRD by providing direct reporting lines to the Dean, facilitating the migration of faculty in WRD to one floor in Patterson Office Tower, establishing a separate budget, and hiring WRD faculty. The affected faculty (the faculty members in the Department of English), the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Council, and the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences have all registered their support.

The resources (human and physical) needed to establish and sustain a Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies are those already assigned or allocated to the division. I certify the administrative feasibility of the attached proposal, which has my full support.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Christine M. Riordan'. The signature is written in a cursive style.

Christine M. Riordan, Ph.D.  
Provost

kh

## Committee to Consider Reorganization of Writing Units at UK

April 1, 2009

### Process:

In December 2008 Provost Subbaswamy and A&S Interim Dean Harling charged the Committee to Consider Reorganization of Writing Units to make recommendations on whether to consolidate the institution's three writing units (the Writing Initiative, Writing Center and Writing Program), and where to locate the new administrative structure. From January 2009 through March 2009 the Committee met at least bi-monthly (and often more) to consider these questions. The Committee began by reviewing the current administrative structures of the three writing units. It reviewed a set of documents attendant to the Writing Program's external review (see Appendix I) as well as two in-house benchmark reports (see Appendix II). The Committee also conducted a series of interviews with internal constituencies and external leaders in the fields of writing and English (see Appendix III for list of interviewees).

Committee members included:

- J. David Johnson, *Chair*, Communications and Information Studies
- Tom Clayton, Department of English
- Janet Eldred, Writing Initiative, Writing Center, and Department of English
- Philipp Kraemer, Chellgren Center and Department of Psychology
- Roxanne Mountford, Department of English
- Jane Peters, Department of Art
- Randall Roorda, Writing Program and Department of English
- Ted Schatzki, Arts and Sciences
- Marsha Watson, Director of Assessment
  
- Kirsten Turner, Arts and Sciences (provided administrative support for the Committee)

Recognizing that there are strengths and weaknesses to every potential administrative home of a consolidated writing unit (these are expanded on in later portions of this report), the Committee reached the following recommendations:

1. the three units should be consolidated into one administrative structure (with one committee member dissenting)
2. the consolidated unit should not be housed in the Office of the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education (unanimously supported)
3. the University should relocate the administrative responsibility of the three integrated writing programs to the College of Arts and Sciences as a first step toward the creation of a new department (with two committee members dissenting and one abstaining)

The following report details these recommendations and offers dissenting opinions where the Committee did not reach consensus.

## **Section I: Consolidation of the Writing Units**

### Identified Advantages of Consolidation

#### *Coherent structural approach to writing instruction*

The importance of undergraduate writing at the University of Kentucky, and indeed at all institutions of higher learning, cannot be overestimated. As a core communication skill, writing competence is a key expectation of UK's external constituencies – accreditors, employers, graduate schools, parents, among others – and thus a principal element of UK's new General Education requirements.

The skill of writing cannot be developed within the constraints of a single semester or academic year, or a single course or even a set of courses; rather, the development of writing skill requires multiple, reinforcing learning experiences across the entirety of the undergraduate experience. These learning experiences must build upon each other in a coherent, planned sequence augmented by mentoring and/or tutoring experiences which provide the scaffolds students need to be successful. Coordinating the activities, approaches, and pedagogical strategies of three separate units with different reporting lines in order to deliver consistently a coherent series of developmental learning experiences would be in the best circumstances enormously challenging; at worst, it can result in a hodge-podge of activities that may or may not assist writing novices to develop their skills. The Dean of the College of Engineering, interviewed by the Committee, put it this way: three different writing programs “seems not commonsensical.” There seems to be at this time a “piecemeal” approach to writing instruction across campus. Consolidation into a single writing unit, lead by either a single administrative writing scholar, or an administrative committee of writing scholars, would provide the opportunity for a focused approach to curricular planning. Such an administrative structure avoids any possible problems of upper-level administrators of different writing units imposing conflicting agendas or priorities. The various academic activities and services the consolidated unit provides could be thus restructured for greater coherence guided by the best practices and cutting-edge approaches of scholars in the discipline.

#### *One-stop shop for end-users and central identity on campus*

If planned for and implemented appropriately, consolidation of the three writing units could result in a “one-stop shop” for the “end-users” of writing support services, the vast majority of whom would likely be writing students. With a consolidated writing unit, current resources could be pooled and used more efficiently. In this way, centralization of these services would encourage expansion and enhancement of support services to other important UK constituencies through community outreach, online consultation, etc., as some benchmark institutions have done (see Appendix II Turner Benchmark). A one-stop shop would of course result in the establishment of a central identity on campus for writing instruction and support services.

#### *One unit, clear leader, more direct access to higher administration*

A significant benefit of consolidation would be the elimination of tangled reporting lines that can result in poor communication, inefficient allocation of resources, and the possibility of the various writing units working at cross-purposes. Perhaps more importantly, a consolidated writing unit with a clear, unitary administrative organization led by an individual writing professional or committee of writing professionals would be a far more effective advocate for writing programs with upper administration and

the campus community at large, both in terms of resources and approach. This unified administrative structure would promote coherence in the activities of the unit through its single articulated vision and mission.

#### *Streamline the budget, enhance efficiency*

While a benchmark analysis of writing units at twenty-eight research institutions reveals no consistent pattern in terms of the institutional organization of such units, it is clear that consolidation and centralization of writing instruction and services would stimulate efficient use of scarce resources by allowing current resources to be pooled and strategically directed to where they are most needed to improve undergraduate writing at UK. A single mission and vision could drive a unitary strategic plan, denoting both short- and long-term strategic goals that could in turn drive an efficient budgeting process.

#### *Greater flexibility in meeting the needs of different colleges*

The enhanced ability to plan strategically and use resources efficiently that will accompany consolidation means that UK's writing programs would be far better positioned to meet the needs of students and other key constituencies. Greater organizational efficiencies yield enhanced flexibility, and this would be particularly useful in terms of how UK writing programs are able to individualize their assistance to the various colleges and their programs.

#### *Coherent approach to training writing instructors*

The unified mission, vision, and approach to writing theory and practice that can result from consolidation of the three writing units would provide a sound foundation upon which to build an integrated and cohesive development program for all writing instructors. Certainly, UK students would benefit from clearly focused and more pedagogically consistent writing instruction, including UK graduate students whose TA responsibilities include writing instruction.

### Identified Disadvantages of Consolidation

#### *Uniform perspective on writing*

Because the three writing units serve different constituents on campus and have quite different reporting structures, their consolidation into a single unit raises questions about their continued diversity and independence from one another. Will consolidation curtail each unit's ability to serve its unique constituents effectively? In response to this question, some universities that have consolidated their writing programs and writing centers into a single unit within a college have allowed their writing across the curriculum programs to report to the provost (*e.g.*, the University of Minnesota). Other universities have consolidated their writing centers and writing across the curriculum programs and placed them under a dean or provost while leaving their writing programs within English or another program (*e.g.*, Miami University of Ohio). As our Benchmark Analysis suggests, "The centralization or decentralization of the institution's writing units is highly dependent on the campus culture and individual history of the units" (Appendix II, Turner Benchmark, page 1). Funding opportunities unique to each campus are among the historical influences on these decisions.

Consolidation at UK should not be viewed as an impediment to the three writing units' independence, since all three units serve the entire campus in unique ways while their directors work closely together. However, consolidation within English, considered by the External Review of the Writing Program to be an inadequate home for the Writing Program, may be a step backward in the quest for maintaining a diverse perspective on writing instruction. In his comments to the committee, Dean Devanathan Sudharshan argued that writing at the University of Kentucky should be guided by research and expertise in writing, and that twenty-first century perspectives of writing—such as the importance of the digital age to contemporary practices—should be a greater focus of writing instruction. Dean Thomas Lester also argued for more faculty specialists in technical writing. Such expanded perspectives on writing and the needs of the campus community are more likely to occur if the three writing units are consolidated outside of English, where requests for expanded expertise on writing are more likely to gain traction.

### *Separation as a risk to current faculty*

While consolidation does not necessarily mean separation from English, it is a possible outcome. Therefore, it is important to consider the impact of separation on the four tenure-line faculty who provide leadership on writing instruction for the entire campus.

Having a tenure home in English is a professional disadvantage for specialists in writing studies. The values identified in the External Review influencing the place of writing in English also affect hiring, merit evaluations, tenure and promotion, and work load allocation for tenure-line faculty with a research focus in writing. Their status is only slightly improved if the writing units are consolidated outside English but their tenure home remains in English. Decisions on hiring, tenure, promotion, evaluations, and work-load will remain in the hands of English, and the status of the current writing studies faculty will continue to be marginal. This situation will change only if writing studies faculty can control their own hiring and tenure and promotion cases. Therefore, if the three writing units are consolidated and moved into a separate program, that program should be moved toward departmental status as soon as possible.

In addition, small programs or departments may be at risk for elimination during difficult budgetary moments or under the leadership of less sympathetic administrators. The four current faculty in writing studies are already a group too small for their combined administrative and leadership obligations. Without adding to their number, it will be difficult to establish curricular innovations needed to bring a more robust and sustainable culture of writing to this campus. The External Review provides a rationale and a place to begin discussions on hiring and establishing a separate department focused on writing studies (see the White Paper developed by Eldred, Mountford, and Roorda in Appendix I).

### *Potential harm to English*

Because the Writing Program offers 75% of all academic credit hours in English, reallocation of funds is inevitable should the three writing units be consolidated and relocated outside of English. English departments can and do survive without their Writing Programs, of course. At Michigan State University, whose Writing Program has been in a separate department since the 1940s, the Department of English has long survived as a separate unit, as have departments more recently separated from writing (e.g., at The University of Minnesota, Syracuse University, and The University of Texas at Austin).

The most important problem for English will be the possible disarticulation of an independent Writing Program from the Graduate Program in Literature. The professional development in the teaching of composition provided by the Writing Program is critical for the success of Literature PhD students on the job market. While it is realistic to assume that many if not most of the TAs employed by an independent writing program will be drawn from English, other departments also welcome this training for their TAs. The greater competition from TAs from other programs may mean that Literature PhD students may not earn as many coveted professional opportunities, such as mentoring new TAs. It may mean that PhD students must apply for TA positions rather than have them granted as a part of their admissions package. Greater competition will be good for writing instruction at the University of Kentucky, and the success of History TAs in the Writing Center suggests the benefits of a more interdisciplinary pool of TAs for all three writing units. While these changes will no doubt be unwelcome in English, they will not necessarily have a detrimental effect on the Graduate Program in Literature. The College of Arts and Sciences should be mindful of these issues in its planning, *e.g.*, by encouraging memoranda of agreement for all departments and programs that send TAs to the three writing units (see Turner Benchmark, Appendix II, which suggests memoranda of agreement for lecturers as well).

Some faculty in English articulate a loss to their disciplinary home should the writing faculty move to another program, not unlike the feeling that surrounded discussions over the establishment of a separate Department of Linguistics. For faculty who envision a more well-balanced curriculum and research agenda for English than currently exists, consolidation of the writing units outside of English may indeed constitute an intellectual loss. However, as our Benchmark Analysis concludes, “Interviewed colleagues remark that the writing units are deeply related in purpose, and thus can benefit immeasurably when placed under the same administrative structure—both in terms of efficiencies and effectiveness” (Turner Benchmark, Appendix II, page 4).

#### Dissenting Opinion Regarding Disadvantages of Consolidation

*(written by English Department Chair Tom Clayton)*

A study of benchmark English departments (see Appendix II) revealed two themes that are relevant to the discussion of writing unit reorganization at UK, beyond the overall trends in benchmark data. Relative to trends, it is very unusual to remove first-year writing programs from English departments. Indeed, in UK’s 19 benchmark institutions, 15 writing programs are administered in English departments. In the last decade, only two writing programs have been removed from benchmark English departments. During the same period, four benchmark universities considered the removal of writing programs from English departments but rejected the proposals. Why have so few been removed, and why have most recent removal proposals been rejected? Answering these questions introduces the two major disadvantages of consolidation identified by UK’s benchmark English departments.

First, removal holds great potential to damage English departments. At most benchmark English departments, as at UK, the graduate program is integrally connected with the writing program. Resources made available by universities for the provision of first-year writing directly support the teaching assistantships that English departments use to attract the most promising graduate students. Further, writing programs advance dual, integrated pedagogical missions in English departments. Of course they

provide first-year writing to university undergraduates. They also provide pedagogical training and professional development to the English TAs who teach most writing program classes, and who will be the next generation of English professors. Within English departments, these dual missions support one another. At institutions where writing programs have separated from English, however, these missions have sometimes disengaged, to the detriment of English departments. At the University of Florida, for example, where the writing program was removed from English in 2004, the writing program administration at first refused to employ English graduate students as teachers; the director's sole agenda was stability and experience in the provision of first-year writing, not the education of new teachers. Though this conflict was resolved by the development of a protocol guaranteeing teaching positions for English graduate students, it illustrates a significant danger for English departments of writing program removal. When writing programs are removed from English departments, mission disarticulation may occur, and English departments may lose resources necessary to attract and train graduate students. As the chair of one benchmark department put it, without the writing program "why would English even need a graduate program?"

Second, removal of writing programs from English departments poses significant dangers for writing program faculty. At benchmark institutions, as at UK, writing programs are administered by a small number of tenure-line faculty with research and teaching interests in rhetoric and composition. Unless these faculty leave English for a new unit that enjoys considerable financial investment from the central administration, they may find themselves at risk. Some will find themselves affiliated with a service unit that will never be able to develop a national research profile. Others will find themselves in a unit whose size makes it vulnerable to changes in university leadership and priorities, particularly in poor budgetary environments; one need only look to the University of Florida to see that even tenure-line professors may find themselves casualties in severe budget crises. Along with damage to English departments, the risks for rhetoric and composition scholars may explain why so few benchmark writing programs have been removed from English departments in the last decade, and why most recent proposals for removal have been rejected.

## **Section II: Administrative Home for Consolidated Writing Unit**

During its deliberations the Committee developed a framework for evaluating the ideal administrative home for a consolidated writing unit. The three options under-consideration (the Department of English; the College of Arts and Sciences; and the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education) were evaluated based on the following criteria:

1. Serve undergraduates well by delivering quality undergraduate writing instruction
2. Personnel
  - a. Hire and retain those with expertise in writing from a broad pool
  - b. Train effectively a cadre of instructors (*e.g.*, TA's, FTL's, and postdocs)
  - c. Offer career development
3. Adaptability to needs of different university units and colleges
4. Centrality- promote institutional connectedness and synergy, develop an identity
5. Attract appropriate resources (especially through development opportunities)
6. Accountability to whole campus



Chart 1. Summary of Three Options across Identified Evaluative Criteria.

	<b>Department of English</b>	<b>College of Arts and Sciences</b>	<b>Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education</b>
<b>Serve UG with Quality Writing Instruction</b>	Mission to serve UG in tension with graduate program	Mission to serve UG becomes more central - runs the risk of becoming dominant role if remains a program (not dept) without a research mission	Mission to serve UG runs the risk of becoming a service unit
<b>Personnel</b>	Access to resources for personnel is less, but offers academic home to tenure/lecturer lines	Greater access to resources, uncertainty as to where to house tenure/lecturer lines	Moderate access to resources for personnel, but not necessarily T/TT faculty, most uncertainty as to where to house current faculty lines
<b>Adaptability</b>	Less flexibility to meet the needs of different units/colleges	More flexibility to meet the needs of different units/colleges	Most flexibility to meet the needs of different units/colleges
<b>Centrality, Connectedness, and Synergy</b>	Another layer added to working across-campus, harder to develop an identity	More ability to work across-campus to build a University-wide program, able to develop an identity	Option with greatest ability to work across-campus, able to develop an identity
<b>Development - Fund-Raising Opportunities</b>	Similar levels of access to College development resources	Slightly more access to College development resources	Access to University Development Office, but no dedicated officer
<b>Accountable to Whole Campus</b>	Less likely to be accountable to entire campus	Moderate ability to be accountable to entire campus	Best ability to be accountable to whole campus

Option I: Department of English

According to Professor Duane Roen, one of the two external reviewers to the External Review of the Writing Program with whom the Committee consulted, there are three different kinds of English departments: those that identify as their mission the cultivation of a culture of writing in their department

and university and do so successfully, those that say they want to develop a culture of writing but do not (for any number of reasons), and those that are categorically against developing a culture of writing. Professor Roen's assessment is that The University of Kentucky's English Department falls into the middle category: a department that has neglected writing, though not necessarily through malice or conscious intent. For this reason, the External Review of the Writing Program recommends a separation from English so that the three writing units might focus on research and instruction in writing as a primary mission. The Committee concurs with this assessment.

The culture of the department is a complex one, and influenced in part by outside forces. In the 1990s, the Council on Postsecondary Education declared that The University of Louisville would become the home of a PhD in Rhetoric and Composition, and that The University of Kentucky would become home to the PhD in Literature. Assumptions about the needs of the Literature Program dominate department planning, and indeed, the department has hired some of the best literature faculty in the nation. As a result of this laudatory (and state-mandated) focus, the English Department has never employed enough rhetoric and composition faculty to fulfill all the leadership needs in writing. Since the late 1980s, when under Department Chair Kevin Kiernan English made its first hires in rhetoric and composition (Eldred and Mortensen), the English Department has never devoted more than four faculty lines devoted to writing studies. At the present moment, four faculty (one of whom is an assistant professor with a joint appointment in Engineering) manage the three writing units, each of which require major administrative oversight (staff, multiple committees, and external outreach inside and outside UK). Because the English Department perceives these faculty members' work to be "service," tangential to its central mission of literary research, their role in the department is marginal, and additional hires (if left to the faculty governance process) are highly unlikely, especially in the face of significant losses in the Literature faculty. The marginal status and difficult workloads for writing faculty have also caused a major recruitment and retention problem—the last writing studies faculty member to leave served only two years.

The primary argument put forward by English against reorganization is that disarticulation of the Writing Program from English will damage the Graduate Program in Literature. The two English department chairs whom the committee consulted by phone stressed this point. The chair at Penn State, which has one of the best PhD programs in rhetoric and composition in the nation, argued that having a Writing Program within the department provides stable employment to graduate students and thus stability to a graduate program. However, she conceded that for the purposes of undergraduate education, better funding and stability might come from separating a Writing Program into a College. The Chair of English at Minnesota, where there is a separate Department of Writing Studies, echoed both points, adding that because "there is no content to writing, writing's placement in English is an historical accident." (The Chair of Minnesota's Department of Writing Studies offered a strong vision for a curriculum in writing at the undergraduate and graduate level, countering the charge that writing has no content.)

While the English Department at Kentucky laments the possibility of losing its Writing Program and rhetoric and composition faculty, the Department has not articulated an intellectual vision that might meld the important role that writing plays in a twenty-first century world with the goals and direction of what is, still, primarily a Department of Literature. The most eloquent appeal came from Associate Professor Andy Doolen, who represented an ad hoc committee in English formed to explore ways to improve the

status of the rhetoric and composition faculty in English. Professor Doolen suggested that there is likely support among the faculty for an MA program, a graduate certificate, and an undergraduate degree in writing studies and the designation of writing studies as one of several areas of excellence. This proposal has not yet been approved by English. The difficulty with the plan for this Committee's purposes is the fact that the three writing units would still be asked to compete with the Graduate Program in Literature for hiring and resources. If the English Department had a broad mission and dedication to developing a culture of writing like many of our benchmarks (e.g., Ohio State, Penn State, North Carolina State University), a different outcome to our deliberations (and the External Review of the Writing Program) would be likely.

#### Alternative Version of Option I: Department of English

*Note: The Committee thought it was important that contrasting views be included. As a result two versions of Option I are offered. The first reflects the sense of the Committee. The second is written by Department Chair Tom Clayton.*

The English Department has been delivering quality instruction in writing to university undergraduates since the 1920s. In the late 1980s, the department started hiring faculty with dedicated training and interests in rhetoric and composition. In the last several years, the rhetoric and composition faculty have begun to develop an identity distinct from the English Department as it is currently oriented. The rhetoric and composition group have now taken a further step in articulating this identity, by endorsing a plan to leave the department and create a separate unit.

Many in the English Department regret the movement away by the rhetoric and composition team. The department's Ad Hoc Committee on Writing Program Separation recently articulated four recommendations for making the department a more amenable home for research and practice in writing; these goals relative to curricular reform, administrative restructuring, department governance, and resources were greeted favorably by the full department in a faculty meeting on 9 March 2009 (Appendix VIII; follow [this link](#) to these goals in the department meeting minutes), and discussion continues. The receptivity of the department to issues of concern among rhetoric and composition faculty suggests that English remains a viable home for the Writing Program—or, indeed, for a unit that consolidates the Program with the Writing Center and / or the Writing Initiative.

The English Department relies on the expertise of the rhetoric and composition group in writing matters, even as we rely on the creative writers, the linguists, and the literature and film scholars for expertise in their areas of inquiry and practice. There would be no structural barriers to the rhetoric and composition group accomplishing new goals for university writing—to meet the evolving needs of different units and colleges; to adapt writing instruction to changing communication environments; to respond to emerging assessment and accountability standards—from an academic and administrative home in the English Department. It would, however, require a commitment in the department, and in the rhetoric and composition group, to work toward these goals together. The English Department has stated its preference to remain a diverse community that includes rhetoric and composition, and the department has articulated its willingness to engage in curricular and structural reforms to realize this preference.

With commitment, issues that could be presented as structural barriers to progress could be remedied. To be sure, the English Department does not have a great deal of control over resources for staffing an expanding writing unit. At the same time, it is important to recall recent history: Over the last decade, the English Department has stated priorities and otherwise made decisions that have led to the hiring of four tenure-line faculty members in rhetoric and composition; as a percentage of faculty-group size, this investment in rhetoric and composition dwarfs faculty investment in all other program areas in the department. Of course there have been times when other program priorities in English have militated against recommending hires in rhetoric and composition—but this same competition happens among departments in the College, and among colleges at the university level. There can never be a guarantee of growth for a single unit in a system with broad needs. That said, if the university or College were to prioritize rhetoric and composition over other needs and provide dedicated resources, the English Department would energetically embrace that priority—as indeed we did last year, when, even as literature searches were cancelled, we enthusiastically endorsed the opportunity to hire two tenure-line professors in rhetoric and composition.

With or without growth in faculty numbers, there is enormous potential for pedagogical and curricular innovation in rhetoric and composition in English. The department relies on the rhetoric and composition group for knowledge and excellence in teacher training, and we would welcome ideas for changing, improving, or otherwise advancing the writing-instructor-training program for the benefit of university undergraduates, graduate students, and other writing teachers. It is true that English cannot provide enough graduate students for all instructional demands in writing (see Appendix II.9, page 5; also at [this link](#)). Certainly one solution would be to expand the allocation of English TA lines to graduate students in other disciplines, as is already happening on a limited basis. The rhetoric and composition faculty could also build a graduate presence in the department, through MA and / or Ph.D. concentrations (as already exist at the MA level for linguistics and TESL). In addition to their contributions as writing instructors, graduate students with dedicated interests in rhetoric and composition would enrich the intellectual life of the English Department, even as their professors would continue to do.

There need be no structural barriers to the enhancement of writing in the English Department, whether that enhancement means program aggregation, faculty expansion, or curricular, pedagogical, or staffing adaptation. All that is required is a new way of thinking by all constituents. The report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Writing Program Separation provides a framework for beginning this important reform.

### Option II: College of Arts and Sciences

The College offers both virtues and uncertainties as a possible home for a writing unit that consolidates the Writing Program, the Writing Initiative, and the Writing Center. The two principal forms such a unit could take in the College are a program, such as GWS and social theory, and a department. An advantage of housing the unit in the College is that it could initially be established as a program, decisions about transforming the program into a department postponed, and the transformation, if decided on, straightforwardly effected.

Another advantage of placing a consolidated unit in A&S is that its intellectual leadership and most of its actual and potential teaching resources are already found there. English, where resources and leadership are presently located, is in A&S. So, too, are other departments that traditionally prize writing and could provide teaching personnel. A college unit could also be more flexible than a department one is in employing personnel from other colleges (though less flexible in this regard than one located in the provost's office). The concentration of actual and potential resources in A&S suggests two further likely desirable repercussions of locating the unit there. The first is a smoother evolution from the present teaching cadre mix of faculty, lecturers, and TAs to a well conceptualized proper mix. The second is that writing instructors will be better taught and enjoy enhanced career development. The reason for the second likely repercussion is that unit leaders will have both unmediated control of resources and direct lines of communication with A&S administration (through which, *e.g.*, they can request additional resources). These direct lines of communication will also strengthen the ability of the unit, with the help of the A&S Dean, to solicit resources from the provost and to develop intercollegiate financing arrangements. A final advantage of a College home over a department one is that such a home will facilitate the development of a writing identity, encourage synergies among writing teachers and researchers, and increase energy, all important ingredients in enhancing the delivery of instruction and strengthening research on writing.

An advantage of a college home over a provost one is that the latter bars the establishment of degree programs in the unit. Relatedly, housing the unit in A&S keeps it closer to the world of research and makes it harder for it to degenerate into a pure service unit. Lastly, the College will be better able than a unit on a higher level is to protect the integrity of the English graduate program.

Housing the unit in A&S has more uncertain implications in three areas. One is the interface between the unit and other colleges. Although the College will presumably be better positioned structurally than a department is (and worse positioned than a provost unit is) both to meet the needs of other university units and to be accountable to the whole campus, there is no guarantee; matters such as this sometimes rest on personalities rather than on structural position. This issue is important also because, although the college—in embracing a wide spectrum of fields—is a fertile place to engage and promote literacy with graphical and visual media, this effort is best served through collaboration with other units, for instance, design, art history, engineering, and communications. Developing a comprehensive approach to writing, communication, and graphical literacy and pedagogy is a desideratum in today's world. The second area for which implications of housing the unit in A&S are uncertain is developmental possibilities.

A third uncertainty concerns the treatment of regular title series writing faculty. Existing faculty are tenured in English. Making a consolidated writing unit an A&S program would result in faculty tenured in one unit dedicating 100% of their effort to the activities of a different unit. These faculty will also often or periodically have nonstandard DOEs. This situation has uncertain implications for the promotion to full of present writing associate professors and for the tenuring of new faculty who are hired in this field. The possible pitfalls that this third uncertainty harbors can be eliminated only by transforming the program into a department, which action will also make the unit a more attractive place to potential hires. Minus this transformation, uncertainties will linger: a nondepartment A&S writing program is an unstable entity.

Mitigating the first two uncertainties are two considerations. First, because the College will respect the university's strategic needs, it is likely to be responsive to other university units and willing to collaborate with them. Second, consolidating the current pieces of writing on a broad platform in the College signals that the university accords writing importance. This signal will enhance the stature of the teaching of writing on campus. This, in turn, might accelerate the development of ties with other units, elevate the unit to greater responsibility, and make writing a more attractive prospect for major gifts. This situation will also strengthen the unit's ability to retain teaching personnel.

Finally, the College believes that it can manage the establishment and evolution of a writing unit relatively easily. It has considerable experience managing smaller academic units and can embrace one more. Whether it has the resources to do this depends on what is implemented or envisioned. The administrative staff required for a consolidated writing unit is already budgeted in the College as the administrative staff presently assigned to the writing program and writing center. In a sense, moreover, the teaching resources presently dedicated to writing can simply be moved over to the new unit, thus reproducing the teaching presently offered without added expenses. In these two regards, the formation of a consolidated writing unit in the College can be, roughly, budget neutral. English, however, plans to remove the "W" from a number of its present 200-level W courses. Although, moreover, the department is also developing a new ENG 205 course to substitute for these present W courses, it plans to set enrollment caps for sections of 205 that are lower than the caps of the latter. This entails that implementing a consolidated unit in the College will require new resources if (1) it is implemented in a way that respects English's justified desire to remove the W from some of its 200-level courses and (2) the total number of students currently taking ENG W courses is to be served after the change. Beyond this, because the ideal teaching mix of lecturers, professors, post-docs, instructors, and teaching assistants differs from the present mix, moving toward this ideal will require further new resources. And, of course, moving the unit toward department status—which is required if a robust textual and graphical writing program is to be offered to the entire campus—will require even additional resources beyond all these (see Appendix II.4)

The proposed Gen Ed learning outcome number two course template envisions the substitution of a three credit course for the present required four credit ENG 104 writing course. If this template becomes university policy, savings will result. These savings can underwrite the implementation of a consolidated unit in the College. It is clear, however, that evolution toward an ideal teaching personnel mix or toward the establishment of a writing department that is capable of covering new media and serving the entire university will require substantial resources from outside the College. The College cannot on its own handle more than the implementation of a consolidated unit—and even this assumes savings from the Gen Ed reform.

Regarding a Degree-granting Department. Many members of the committee find a degree-granting department the most attractive option. A department enhances the university's ability to compete for, hire, promote, and retain faculty with expertise in writing, rhetoric, and new media. A department also does not confront the above alluded to issues concerning the tenuring and promotion of faculty who are technically in one unit but who work in another. A department, furthermore, can deliver first-year writing while also allowing for a richer curriculum that includes programs for undergraduate majors and minors and for graduate degrees and certificates; combined with faculty research, these programs will result in

improved pedagogy and more imaginative and variable writing and graphic options. Finally, a department facilitates community outreach, the likelihood of attracting research grant funds and development monies, and the possibility of attaining national prominence. This option does have problems and possible pitfalls. Perhaps most obviously, a department costs more than a program does. Being both new and small in size, moreover, it would be vulnerable in poor budget times. A writing studies one with a strong research focus could also forget its roots in service. As long as writing remains a University concern, however, these problems will be mitigated.

### Option III: Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education

The rationale for assigning administrative responsibility for undergraduate writing programs to the Associate Provost for Undergraduate Education (APUE) is based on at least four considerations: (1) Teaching of writing transcends the responsibility of any one academic college or department; (2) centralized administration of the writing initiative could facilitate expansion of writing intensive courses by avoiding the reluctance of departments and colleges to participate in programs perceived to be aligned with one college or department; (3) the potential advantages of (2) could be extended by an integrated model of writing instruction (i.e., the Writing Initiative, Writing Program, and Writing Center managed as a unit); (4) both instructional and curricular aspects of undergraduate writing could be enhanced by placing writing programs together with other units and programs targeted to support undergraduate education. One advantage of such a structure is that it could facilitate a more coherent, intentional approach to general education and the first-year experience of undergraduates.

In order for these advantages to be realized, however, the domain of the APUE must be appropriately configured. The ideal model would be a general college; one that includes faculty appointments, salary lines for instructors (adjuncts, lecturers, PTIs, and TAs), a professional advising staff, and additional educational support staff. Currently, the Provost's expectation for the domain of the APUE does not include any sense of a general college. Consequently, placement of an integrated writing unit under the APUE offers few benefits and considerable risks. One conspicuous risk is that the status of writing instruction could degenerate. Without the support and commitment of an academic department, undergraduate programs within a research university are often less well supported, nurtured and protected. Another concern is that whenever instructional programs are detached from an academic department, responsibility for the oversight of the curriculum is dissociated from the implementation of the curriculum; i.e., responsibility for determining what is to be taught and responsibility for the actual teaching and management of teaching falls to different sets of individuals. This dissociation contradicts the conventional functional structure in which all aspects of an academic program are integrated and assigned as a responsibility to the same group of full-time, tenured faculty.

Given the current configuration of the domain of the APUE and the pressing need to improve undergraduate writing instruction, it is not in the best interest of students or faculty to move administration of undergraduate writing to the APUE.

#### Option IV: Alternative for an Administrative Home

The Committee considered alternative administrative homes of a newly consolidated writing unit, including a graduate center, decentralized campus centers, and an interdisciplinary program in the College of Communications and Information Studies. Of these other options, the Committee explored the last most fully.

##### *Program in the College of Communications and Information Studies*

Another general option would be to move the three consolidated writing units to another college. Both Engineering and Agriculture have substantial interests and resources invested in communication programs of various sorts and might be interesting alternatives, but the college that received the most attention was Communications and Information Studies. Oral and written communication have been linked in USP's communication requirement for over a decade with prior university reports recommending a closer linkage between written and oral communication courses often associated with a focus on rhetoric. The proposed GERA reforms make this linkage even closer under the communication rubric. Communication has also been linked to the Writing Center through its CommSult program historically. CCIS as an institutional home for the consolidated writing units also has a number of other advantages: the college is receptive to a variety of title series, differential assignments for its faculty; its graduate program is shared across the entire college; the experience of the School of Journalism and Telecommunications faculty with convergence and new media; and a faculty in the School of Library and Information Science who are very interested in information literacy. These last two advantages also would establish a starting point for very interesting synergies that could provide the foundation for innovative approaches to the emerging digital age.

A move to CCIS also has some compelling disadvantages: CCIS has a professional/disciplinary focus that might hamper campus-wide writing initiatives; the question of where to tenure writing/composition/rhetoric faculty would still be problematic; inadequate administrative staffing (*e.g.*, no associate dean for undergraduate education); further distancing the writing units from their traditional home in English; distancing the units from the pool of potential TAs in Arts and Sciences; and a lack of adequate physical space. Most importantly in the eyes of the soon to be departing current dean are: the traditionally inadequate funding for oral communication and reluctance to increase said funding centrally; one of the highest student to faculty ratios on campus for the college's current majors that make taking on a major new responsibility very problematic; and taking on this major new responsibility, in a relatively small college, would inevitably entail the creation of a new unit within the college merged with oral communication. Finally, most of the writing faculty now are humanists, familiar with the A&S tradition; communications as a field has grown increasingly professional in focus. It draws heavily from social science conventions.





College of Arts and Sciences

Office of the Dean  
202 Patterson Office Tower  
Lexington, KY 40506-0027

859 257-8354  
*fax* 859 323-1073

[www.as.uky.edu](http://www.as.uky.edu)

August 23, 2013

To whom it may concern:

I am writing in the strongest possible terms to support the proposal submitted by the Division of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Media to become a department in the College of Arts and Sciences. In the College's opinion, it is an opportune moment in time (1) to enhance attention to writing and rhetoric as key media of social interaction, especially in the digital environments that increasingly dominate commerce, education, and home, and (2) to strengthen the education of students at the University of Kentucky in this area. The establishment of a Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital media is an intellectually sensible and institutionally effective way of achieving these ends.

As an historian, I take a long view on current developments. With the rise of the Internet, we are currently undergoing a shift in literacy practices that is as dramatic as the one that followed the development of the printing press in the fifteenth century. Gutenberg's invention allowed for the mass production of books, spreading reading to the public. The Internet now allows anyone with access to a computer to publish their own writing and to create their own visuals, vastly increasing the speed with which ideas are communicated in new public spaces. The College needs a unit that is keyed to and a leader in digital media education. The current Division of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Media has been at the forefront of changing how writing and communication are taught at the University. It joined with the Department of Communication to create an integrated UKCore Composition and Communication Program that combines multiple literacies in one two-sequence course. It has also introduced a spate of innovative new courses both in writing writ large and in the digital realm. To date, however, the Division has not reached its full potential

The Division is currently housed in the Department of English. As the proposal details, the missions of our English Department and Division of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Media (WRD) do not coincide. The differences are most acute in the area of digital research and instruction, which constitute a key focus of the WRD faculty and curriculum. Moreover, the distinct needs of the Department and the Division can too easily be seen through zero-sum lenses, according to which maintaining the literature component of the Department excludes serious investment in the Division. Even before I became Dean, two UK committees—an external review committee and an internal intercollegiate one—concluded that it would be best to establish WRD as an independent department. At my previous institution (Michigan State), furthermore, I had seen splendid teaching and research conducted in that institution's unique Department of Writing and American Studies. Consequently, when I became Dean I decided that the business of writing and rhetoric, and especially their instruction and study in digital environments, could be best enhanced by the establishment of an autonomous WRD Department.

The benefits of an outstanding faculty devoting their time to teaching and research in this area are manifold. The need for good writing and for an appreciation and mastery of the subtle power of rhetoric will never die so long as humans interact and language does not devolve solely into oral speech. Students' abilities to succeed in many areas of their subsequent lives are only strengthened if they possess these capabilities. The Commonwealth, too, obviously benefits from a citizenry that enjoys these skills, through a more clairvoyant public sphere and through the greater attractiveness such a citizenry has for business investment, to mention just two benefits. Teaching of and research into these matters is only enhanced by the increased focus on them brought by the existence of a separate department.

The creation of this Department will not require any additional resources. The Division currently has sufficient faculty, staff support, and teaching resources to exist as a department. The College, moreover, is fully committed to maintaining the resources needed to keep the Department flourishing in the future. Quality instruction and research into writing and rhetoric, especially—given current social trends—in digital media, are just too important not to highlight and to provide students sustained and focused opportunities in.

The subject matter is so important, and the institutional context so configured, that the most effective and auspicious way to continue outstanding instruction and research in the areas of writing, rhetoric, and digital media is to establish an autonomous department dedicated to them. The College wholeheartedly supports WRD's proposal to become this department.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Kornbluh', written in a cursive style.

Mark Lawrence Kornbluh  
Dean



Department of English  
1215 Patterson Office Tower  
Lexington, KY 40506-0027  
859 257-7008  
*fax* 859 323-1072  
[www.as.uky.edu/English](http://www.as.uky.edu/English)

August 26, 2013

Mark Kornbluh, Dean  
College of Arts & Sciences  
202 Patterson Office Tower  
University of Kentucky

Dear Dean Kornbluh:

After a thorough and open discussion at the English Department's August 19<sup>th</sup> retreat, the Department voted to endorse the separation of the English Department and the Writing Rhetoric and Digital Media Division into separate Departments. The vote was 28 in favor and 3 opposed. As Chair, I also endorse the separation and believe it is in the English Department's long-term interest.

As the vote indicates, support for the creation of separate departments is now strong, with over 90% of voting English faculty in agreement. During the meeting, faculty expressed several concerns, including potential competition for students with a new WRD Department, "turf battles" over future course offerings, the potential for difficulty arising from English graduate students teaching mostly outside the Department, and anxiety about the effects that may follow from a changed University budgeting model. At the same time, a large majority believes that the WRD faculty are distinct in intellectual orientation, academic pursuits, and departmental goals. We anticipate that the College will help to mediate any disagreements that may arise. Indeed, this vote was motivated by the College's leadership and by English faculty's desire to work collegially and effectively with WRD as it develops.

English believes that the College has laid the groundwork for close and positive relationships with WRD. The July 22<sup>nd</sup> College memo guaranteeing 42 teaching lines for ENG graduate students and 5 for LIN graduate students in the WRD program provides a beneficial level of institutional stability. If and when the WRD writing curriculum changes, we anticipate working with WRD faculty and the College to maintain the steady employment of ENG and LIN students in WRD as a collective priority. English also looks forward to working with WRD on joint intellectual opportunities for our units and on developing fruitful connections between our courses and degrees.

Going back at least fifty years, the English Department at the University of Kentucky has a long history of nurturing successful units that go on to become independent and significant contributors to the University's mission. While the last few years have been challenging, we anticipate developing an array of strong ties to WRD that benefit both departments, the College of Arts & Sciences, and the University as a whole.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeffory A. Clymer", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jeffory A. Clymer  
Professor and Chairperson

August 27, 2013

Mark Lawrence Kornbluh  
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences  
202 Patterson Office Tower  
Campus 0027

Dear Mark:

The College of Arts and Sciences Executive Committee discussed the WRD proposal, now officially called Writing, Rhetoric and Digital Studies. The Committee was concerned about the demand for the program and potential conflicts with the College of Communication and Information Studies and with the possible duplication of a similar program at the University of Louisville. The Dean assured the Committee that it was a necessary program and that there was little to no impact on the budget. He advised them to move forward with the changes. The Committee voted 4-1 to support the formation of the new WRD department.

Sincerely,



Brian Rymond  
Chair, Arts & Science Executive Committee



Division of Writing, Rhetoric,  
and Digital Media  
1353 Patterson Office Tower  
Lexington, KY 40506-0027  
859 257-7002  
fax 859 323-1072  
 wrd.as.uky.edu

## Proposal for a Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Division Information	1
2. Division Contact	2
3. Introduction	2
4. History	2
5. Justification	4
6. Mission Statement	11
7. Organizational Structure	11
8. Personnel Associated with WRD	23
9. Proposal Development Process	25
10. Timeline for Key Events in Proposed Change	26
11. Financial Viability of Proposed Unit	26
12. Evidence of Support	27
13. Proposal's Impact on Current and Future Students	27
14. Assessment	28
15. Accreditation and Other Implications of Reorganization	30
16. Conclusion	30
17. Appendices	32

### DIVISION INFORMATION

Current Unit Title: Division of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies  
Primary College: College of Arts and Sciences  
CIP Code: 23.1304  
CIP Title: Rhetoric and Composition  
CIP Description: A program that focuses on the humanistic and scientific study of rhetoric, composition, literacy, and language/linguistic theories and their practical and pedagogical applications. Includes instruction in historical and contemporary rhetoric/composition theories; composition and criticism of written, visual, and mixed-media texts; analysis of literacy practices in cultural and cross-cultural contexts; and writing program administration.

## CONTACT INFORMATION

Name: Roxanne Mountford, former Director, Division of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies  
 Email: mountford@uky.edu  
 Phone: 859-257-7002

## INTRODUCTION

The faculty of the Division of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies (WRD), an independent unit in the Department of English, propose to organize as a separate department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies. Supported by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the faculty in the Department of English, this new department would be the first of its kind in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. In organization and mission, the new department is modeled on autonomous departments of writing and rhetoric at several of our institutional benchmarks, including the University of Minnesota and the University of Texas, Austin.

As we argue below, we believe the University of Kentucky would be well served by a new department focused on research and teaching in the arts of writing and rhetoric as they are practiced in the real world. For us, this especially means embracing the ubiquity of digital media and redefining writing for this context. Dedicated to the humanistic study of writing and rhetoric in all its forms, including emerging media and literacies in a variety of cultural settings, our faculty aspire to prepare students for leading roles in an innovation-driven economy (Goal #1 in the University of Kentucky's 2009-2014 Strategic Plan), in which their ability to understand and influence others increasingly depends on their facility with and critical understanding of digital media. We are also deeply committed to connecting our intellectual capital to the problems and aspirations of Kentuckians and the world beyond the Commonwealth through our research (Goal #2) and outreach (Goal #5). Writers, rhetoricians, and digital media experts, we work on real-world problems, including literacy in local communities, writing in the workplace, the formation of digital cultures, the creation of documentaries, the nature of public controversies, and the rhetorical effect of visuals in print and digital environments. Our faculty believe we can best serve a strategic role in the success of this university within a department home of our own.

## HISTORY

In 2007, the College of Arts and Sciences (A&S) commissioned an external review of the Writing Program, and in their 2008 report, the reviewers argued that the University of Kentucky should separate the Writing Program from the Department of English and create a new department. In 2009, the Provost and the Interim Dean of A&S charged an interdisciplinary committee—the Committee to Consider Reorganization of Writing Units at UK (CCRWU)—to study the external review and to do further research. The CCRWU came to the same conclusion, advocating a reorganization of writing faculty and services into a single department that could meet the needs of writers across the university. They argued that such a department would provide:

- 1) A coherent structural approach to writing instruction
- 2) A one-stop shop for end-users and central identity on campus
- 3) One unit, with a clear leader, and more direct access to higher administration
- 4) Greater flexibility in meeting the needs of different colleges
- 5) A coherent approach to training writing instructors.

Based on the blueprints of these studies, planning for a Division of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies<sup>1</sup> began in Fall 2009, with initial faculty and lecturer hires (a total of 8) authorized by Dean Mark Kornbluh and Provost Kumble Subbaswamy. Five existing lecturers in English and two and half tenure-stream faculty moved to the Division, with Roxanne Mountford appointed Director. The newly organized faculty in the Division voted to seek departmental status in September 2010, having already received the blessing of the College and the Department of English to begin functioning as a semi-autonomous unit, with independent hiring plans and budgets. The two staff positions originally assigned to the Writing Program now serve the Division as a whole. A single business manager serves WRD and English. After faculty hires in 2010, 2011, and 2012, the unit has enough faculty (9.25 tenure-stream faculty and 6 lecturers), staff (2), and TAs (65) to transition to department status without additional resources. The Department of English (now primarily on the 12<sup>th</sup> floor) and the Division (now fully on the 13<sup>th</sup> floor) have consolidated faculty and staff offices in Patterson Office Tower and operate with separate budgets.

WRD's faculty are experts in the history and theory of rhetoric, scientific and technical writing, composition theory and history, cultural studies of writing and rhetoric, and the role of emerging media on culture and society. Given our commitments to both knowing and doing (what the ancients called *phronesis*, or practical wisdom), our faculty are themselves accomplished writers; many are also talented producers of digital media (including documentary film production, web site design, TMI encoding, audio essay production, podcasting, and document design).

WRD faculty are also innovative program-builders. The Division played a leadership role (with the Division of Instructional Communication in the College of Communication and Information) in developing the innovative Composition and Communication Program, one of the first programs of its kind in the nation and a pillar of the UK Core General Education Program. The Division faculty are responsible for teaching and administering 60% of the UK Core credits in Composition and Communication and also offer the highest percentage of courses fulfilling the Graduation Writing Requirement.

In addition, the Division provides tutoring services through the Writing Center for students and faculty and consults on the instruction of writing and digital media at the university (e.g., through leadership in Wired, the College of A&S's innovative residential college). Finally,

---

<sup>1</sup> The College of A&S and the Provost approved the name "Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Media," the name the Division used until Spring 2013. In order to avoid confusion with the Media Arts and Studies program in the College of CI (renamed after WRD's founding in 2010), the faculty voted to rename the proposed department and BA/BS on January 15, 2013. To avoid confusion in this document, we use the new name throughout.



since Spring 2011, the faculty in WRD have built on a small core of advanced writing and editing courses to build a new BA and BS in Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies, teaching the new courses experimentally and refining the contours of the degree. The final elements of the undergraduate degree programs were approved in WRD on 2/21/12, and the Proposal was approved by the College of A&S in Spring 2012 and by the Undergraduate Council in Spring 2013.

## JUSTIFICATION

### 1) *English and WRD have different missions.*

In 2009, the CCRWU studied benchmark institutions and interviewed department chairs (both of English and Writing and Rhetoric nationwide) as well as deans within the University of Kentucky. They also reviewed data gathered during the external review of the Writing Program and the conclusions of the external reviewers. The Committee learned that English departments nationwide vary in their interest in building a “culture of writing” at their universities. Some, including benchmark university Penn State, would never need a department of WRD, since degree programs within English and university services like the Writing Program and Writing Center are led by top rhetoric and composition specialists. Others have focused their energies and resources on building literary studies and have hired few rhetoric and composition scholars.

The University of Kentucky falls into the latter category. In establishing a highly ranked PhD in English with a focus on literary studies, the Department of English has long focused hiring requests on the needs of the literature program. As a result, up until 2008, UK’s English department had only three dedicated faculty lines in rhetoric and composition at a time. These faculty were responsible for the three major writing units on campus at the time: the Writing Center, the Writing Program, and the Writing Initiative. “Because the English Department perceives these faculty members’ work to be ‘service,’ tangential to its central mission of literary research,” the CCRWU reported, “their role in the department is marginal, and additional hires (if left to the faculty governance process) are highly unlikely, especially in the face of significant losses in the Literature faculty. The marginal status and difficult workloads for writing faculty have also caused a major recruitment and retention problem—the last writing studies faculty member to leave served only two years” (8).

With such limited resources devoted to writing, the University has struggled to find the expertise to mount new courses to serve students across the disciplines. The Committee was especially sympathetic to the testimony of deans of other colleges, one of whom argued that “the University of Kentucky should be guided by research and expertise in writing, and . . . twenty-first century perspectives of writing—such as the importance of the digital age to contemporary practices—should be a greater focus of writing instruction.” The Committee concluded that “Such expanded perspectives on writing and the needs of the campus community are more likely to occur if the three writing units are consolidated outside of English, where requests for expanded expertise on writing are more likely to gain traction” (4). They further concluded that a department focused on writing studies would serve as a better home for any new faculty hires.

In addition, English, with a primary identity as a department of literary studies, has developed procedures for evaluating and promoting faculty who primarily publish monographs (the linguists can be evaluated on journal articles alone). This means that any digital publication or resource that we develop is “ancillary” to the work rewarded by English. Several of our faculty are leaders in the scholarly use of social and digital media. WRD’s newly adopted by-laws allow us to promote and tenure a faculty member on work that is primarily digital in nature. Why is this important? If the University of Kentucky values cutting-edge instruction in writing, then it must hire and evaluate faculty who have adopted and work in multimedia as a primary outlet for their research and creative work. If standards of review and evaluation fail to keep pace with innovation, the University will not be able to keep these innovative faculty.

Another major difference between English and WRD is in our treatment of our lecturers. WRD regards lecturers as what they are: teaching faculty. Our lecturers are enfranchised and serve on all major committees (except Graduate Studies). The field of rhetoric and composition has a long history of working on the ethical treatment of contingent faculty, so when the University of Kentucky revised the lecturer ARs, we worked to make these appointments truly faculty positions. We have established a supportive and creative place to work, in which a lecturer who writes and produces documentaries is just as valuable as an associate professor who publishes books on digital media. Both help us build and create the curriculum the Commonwealth needs.

As a department, we will be able to reward all faculty for the innovative work we have hired them to do. If WRD remains in English, we do not know if we will be guaranteed direct access to the College of A&S to argue for new or replacement hires, and we certainly will not be able to apply our own metrics to promotion and tenure decisions. We believe department status is critical to our ability not only to hold on to the gains we have made thus far for the University of Kentucky but also to build on this success for the future.

*2) An increasing number of our benchmark institutions are founding independent Writing Programs and Departments.*

Prior to the mid-nineteenth century, English departments were unknown. Instead, colleges and universities employed rhetoricians who were responsible for teaching writing, speaking, and *belles-lettres*. This classical education required four years of training in rhetoric. The modern university is based on the German model of education, in which research and graduate education were dominant and disciplines organized around research rather than undergraduate education. The German education system recognized philology as a viable pathway of research in both ancient and modern languages, but the study of rhetoric was unknown.

As universities developed specializations in the United States, some preserved the dominance of rhetoric in undergraduate education by founding Departments of Rhetoric (e.g., the University of Michigan and Ohio State University). But such departments were soon transformed into the English departments we know today, with writing and rhetoric relegated to support services rather than research subjects equally worthy of study as literature and philology. Frustrated with this climate, rhetoricians who taught public

speaking began leaving English around 1914 to found departments of communication. But writing teachers largely stayed. Following a brief period of experimentation, a few universities founded hybrid departments that recombined instruction in speech and writing (e.g., the Department of Rhetoric at Iowa, which maintains this original mission). John Gerber founded such a program at Michigan State in the 1940s, and the Writing Program has remained in this separate department (now the vibrant Department of Writing and American Culture) to the present day.

The movement to reestablish rhetoric as an important university subject in the modern period began in earnest around 1963 within the Conference on College Composition and Communication. By 1984, at least a dozen graduate programs in rhetoric and composition had been established (Hairston 272), and in 2005, the NRC recognized rhetoric and composition as an emerging field of study, with more than 70 PhD programs in this area of specialization and in the related field of scientific and technical communication. More than one-third of all job announcements reported in the annual Job Information List of the Modern Language Association are in this field. In 2010, the National Center for Educational Statistics issued CIP codes for the field. There are now at least 33 departments of writing and/or rhetoric in the United States and many more autonomous Writing Programs (without departmental status) and 68 institutions offering 72 majors and tracks in writing and rhetoric. Because writing and rhetorical activity appear in all forms of media (old and new), many of these departments and majors include significant coursework in digital media.

Tables 1 and 2 below offer comparisons among institutions with departments similar to WRD. All of these departments began as and continue to be the home of university-wide writing programs. The University of Iowa's Department of Rhetoric offers one of the oldest hybrid courses in writing and public speaking in the nation. Iowa's faculty teach this curriculum, train graduate students from other departments to teach it, and serve as graduate faculty in English and Communication. Michigan State University's Department of Writing and American Studies offers both undergraduate and graduate degrees in writing and rhetoric and is unique nationwide because it is also the home for an interdisciplinary faculty in American Studies. Syracuse University's Writing Program (actually a department) also offers undergraduate and graduate degrees in writing and rhetoric. The University of Central Florida's Department of Writing and Rhetoric offers an MA program in addition to the required courses in composition. The University of Minnesota's Department of Writing Studies was founded as a program in scientific and professional writing in the College of Agriculture; the department moved to the College of Liberal Arts and was reorganized but continues to offer a major in scientific and technical writing, an MA, and a PhD. The University of Texas at Austin's Department of Rhetoric and Writing offers only the BA, but UT's faculty offer a highly respected track in rhetoric and composition through the English Department at the graduate level. In general, the larger the faculty of these units, the larger the size of undergraduate majors (Iowa, for example, does not have enough faculty to offer a degree).

TABLE 1: Benchmark Comparisons of Staffing and Institutional Status

Institution	Admin Unit	Location	Full-time Faculty	Faculty Joint Appt	Faculty Affiliate	Staff
U of Iowa	Dept	Liberal Arts & Sciences	4 + 11 lecturers	1	0	1 (with 4 shared)
Michigan State U	Dept	Arts & Letters	65	1	0	3
Syracuse U	Dept	Arts & Sciences	11	1	8	2
U of Central FL	Dept	Arts & Humanities	39	1	5	5
U of Minnesota	Dept	Liberal Arts	13	0	15	7
U of Texas, Austin	Dept	Liberal Arts	15	0	9	8

TABLE 2: Benchmark Comparisons of Degrees Awarded Yearly

Institution	Major	Minor	MA	PhD	Certificate (UG)	Certificate (G)
U of Iowa	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Michigan State U	40	0	8	7	0	0
Syracuse U	22	30	0	2	N/A	N/A
U of Central FL	N/A	N/A	3	N/A	N/A	3
U of Minnesota	21	N/A	6	5	N/A	N/A
U of Texas, Austin	21	0	6*	5*	N/A	N/A

\*These degrees were awarded in English. The department has no graduate program of its own.

University of Kentucky's institutional benchmarks include English departments with significant PhD programs in rhetoric and composition. None have the significant numbers of faculty dedicated to the study and teaching of writing and rhetoric available at Michigan

State or the University of Central Florida. For example, the University of Arizona English department, which has had a PhD program in rhetoric and composition since the late 1980s, employs only six tenure-line faculty in rhetoric and composition (two of whom are on phased retirement, and one of whom is an associate provost), out of a faculty that numbers just under 60. Literature faculty at Arizona overwhelmingly outnumber the other specialties (which include English as a Second Language and Creative Writing).

Part of the issue is the way that English studies has evolved—around historical literary periods and genres of literature. It takes a lot of faculty to represent every literary period and genre. In this sense, a migration of faculty from English into a department of writing and rhetoric is good for students and the institution as a whole, since English can focus hiring requests on fewer specialties, leaving a department like the one we are proposing to request and raise funds to hire specialists who can help us serve writers across campus.

*3) Creation of a Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies maximizes the benefit that a program in this area can provide to students.*

The University of Kentucky aspires to “prepare students for leading roles in an innovation-driven economy and global society” (Goal #1 of our Strategic Plan). A new department of WRD directly contributes to this goal by focusing resources and intellectual labor on improving student success across the curriculum (Objective 1.2) and by producing graduates who are prepared to succeed in professional and community settings (Object 1.3).

In 2010, the Association of American Colleges and Universities released the results of a national survey of employers. Of those who responded, 89% identified written and oral communication as an essential learning outcome that needed greater emphasis in higher education—the #1 item on the employer wish list. In addition, employers reported that greater attention needed to be paid to critical thinking and analytic reasoning (81%), applied knowledge in real-world settings (79%), complex problem solving (75%), teamwork skills in diverse groups (71%), creativity and innovation (70%), information literacy (68%), and civic knowledge, participation, and engagement (52%).

As a unit, WRD faculty are committed to providing students with immersion in twenty-first century literacy education: writing for multiple audiences in flat-print and digital environments and the study of rhetoric and social media. Through our current courses, proposed BA/BS, and future degrees, we will offer the Commonwealth of Kentucky (and surrounding states) graduates who are prepared to enter professional and community settings in which writing and advocacy (public and private) using old and new media is necessary. The courses will serve students with a variety of interests, including publishing, politics, the writing of literary non-fiction, environmental issues, community advocacy, science and technical writing, and business and entrepreneurship.

The learning goals requested by employers who responded to the AACU are specifically addressed in WRD’s courses (both for UK Core and for the major). In our Composition and Communication courses, students receive intensive practice in written, oral, and visual communication; teamwork skills; and information literacy. In our more advanced courses, students also receive intensive study of and practice in rhetoric, which improves their critical thinking and analytic reasoning skills. Through our courses on multimedia, we provide

opportunities for students to push on their own creativity and challenge them to invent new pathways for public expression. Finally, through service-learning opportunities and our planned internship program, students apply their knowledge of writing, rhetoric, and/or digital media in real-world settings. One example is a course taught by Jenny Rice, engaging students in gathering oral histories at the Lexington Farmer's Market, using old-fashioned interviewing skills and extensive narrative and analytic writing to create exciting new digital archives for the public. These kinds of educational experiences increase student success by linking students to real-world projects and requiring them to create effective digital and print-based documents that honor the people they have met in the community.

Attracting and retaining faculty who have a background and training in the field of rhetoric and composition means that the University of Kentucky can provide such innovative coursework. But it also means that the University of Kentucky has on hand professionals who have studied writing pedagogy (including professional writing, writing assessment, multimedia approaches to teaching writing, and literacy studies) and are prepared to provide leadership of writing services on campus such as the UK Writing Center and the Composition and Communication curriculum (as taught in A&S). We also tutor student athletes in writing (through CATS), provide leadership to Wired (the A&S residential college, which provides digitally-advanced courses), manage the Graduation Writing Requirement, teach writing in the Freshman Summer Program, and teach writing for students who qualify for the Academic Preparedness Program.

Even within English departments that have a strong number of rhetoric and composition scholars, first-year composition and writing services on campus are peripheral to literary studies and therefore considered lower status work. In contrast, departments of writing and rhetoric view teaching writing as *the core mission*, and leadership of first-year composition as a prestigious appointment. All upper-level courses are, in turn, grounded in the work of lower-division writing and the writing services that surround them. Creating a Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies is the best way to focus sole energy on preparing students for careers (or other coursework) in which twenty-first century writing skills are required. This is, arguably, good for all students.

#### 4) *Creation of a department of WRD is good for the Commonwealth of Kentucky.*

A department of WRD benefits the Commonwealth of Kentucky in two ways: 1) by providing faculty who are deeply engaged in outreach and involved in the study of issues of public importance, and 2) by graduating students who can benefit the Commonwealth through their knowledge and skills.

As the CCRWU noted, an important consideration for the University of Kentucky has been how to attract and retain the best faculty in rhetoric and composition for the good of the Commonwealth. Since the Provost and the College of A&S authorized new hires in Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies, the University of Kentucky has already hired and retained some of the best faculty in the country, known especially for their work in public rhetorics and digital media.

The first new hires in WRD included Adam Banks, who is the leading scholar in the nation in African American rhetoric and the digital divide; Jeff Rice, who is the rising star in digital

media and writing studies; Jenny Rice, who studies public controversies and teaches innovative uses of new media and writing; and Janice Fernheimer, who studies rhetoric in the Jewish diaspora. (Vershawn Young, who studies performance studies and rhetoric, was also hired, but has since chosen to join the Department of English.) These scholars were all hired away from PhD-granting departments in rhetoric and composition on the promise of developing something new in the field of rhetoric and composition. They joined Mountford, Randall Roorda, and Bill Endres, an innovative scholar of the digital humanities. Two more tenure-stream faculty have now joined them: Steven Alvarez, a specialist in literacy among Hispanic immigrant groups, and Brian McNely, who works on writing and social media use in organizations (nonprofit and corporate). Also hired are talented lecturers with PhDs in rhetoric and composition (Abboud and Scalise) and English (Connors-Manke, Marksbury, Rogers-Carpenter), and a talented MA (Judith Gatton Prats, who was one of the first directors of the Writing Center).

In all that we do, WRD faculty work to connect our teaching and research mission with problems in the larger society. Rhetoric's crucial role in public life has been recognized for millennia, both as a focus of study and outreach. We extend rhetorical education to citizens and youth of the Commonwealth who are not enrolled at the University of Kentucky (e.g., through Adam Banks' community classes in Lexington and Versailles) and in contexts where civil discourse is in need of intervention, such as Israel and the Palestinian Authority (e.g., through Janice Fernheimer's development activities in the region). This outreach grows out of our faculty's investigations into public life. Adam Banks studies the digital divide within, and digital innovation of, African-American communities. Jenny Rice studies public controversies, identifying reasons why citizens choose not to become involved in problems in the community that affect them. Brian McNely studies the ways in which workplaces (commercial and nonprofit) utilize social media to facilitate writing. Steven Alvarez studies the efforts of immigrant families to learn spoken and written English, working to identify better modes of intervention.

Today's social and professional landscape requires educated participants who can move adroitly within media environments; understand the rhetorical frameworks of print and digital writing; and recognize, evaluate, and adapt to shifts in culture and technology, all the while understanding the ethical implications of their work. WRD will send graduates into the Commonwealth who can join a variety of professions in which these skills are valued, including marketing, business management, nonprofit leadership, publishing, and education. In addition, our undergraduate degrees will provide a firm foundation for students entering into professional schools, including law. By encouraging internships in the community, we also connect students to specific workplaces in the Commonwealth, which will increase their success after graduation and provide them with the experience of connecting their knowledge of writing and rhetoric in both old and new media to real-world situations. If a workplace chooses to hire some of our students after their internships have ended, the Commonwealth benefits directly from our work.

## MISSION STATEMENT

The Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies (WRD) serves the University of Kentucky, local Lexington communities, and the broader Commonwealth of Kentucky through the study and teaching of writing and rhetoric as social action in all genres and modalities. We teach our students and work with our constituents from the foundational idea that writing and rhetoric are important not only for professional success, but also for the development of an informed, engaged citizenry. We research and teach the production, critical analysis, and revision of visuals, texts, performances, and other persuasive practices across diverse social, disciplinary, and cultural contexts. As we explore innovative uses of digital media, we also critically examine the ways technology pushes us into new relationships and contexts for rhetoric and writing practices. Finally, we believe that writing, rhetoric, and the use and examination of digital media must move beyond the classroom, and, therefore, we practice and teach civic engagement, advocacy, community building, and critical inquiry in public spaces. We participate in the University of Kentucky's Land Grant mission of applied research and outreach.

## ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

The new department reports directly to the Dean of the College of A&S and will be governed by the following By-Laws, passed in final form on 2/21/12.

### **By-Laws**

#### **Article I: Governance**

##### **Section 1: Membership**

**A.** The voting membership includes all persons in the Department on regular appointment or half-time appointment holding the rank of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor and any persons enfranchised by the voting membership. Voting rights are subject to the conditions imposed by the University GRs and ARs and the Rules of the College of Arts and Sciences.

**B.** Non-voting members, including affiliated faculty and appointed/elected representatives for adjunct instructors, teaching assistants, and undergraduates, are welcome to attend Department meetings.

**C.** The Department defines "faculty" as anyone holding the rank of Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor.

##### **Section 2: Organization**

###### **A. Officers and Staff**



### **1. Department Chair** (Tenured faculty position)

The Chair is selected by the Dean of the College, in accordance with university procedures and in consultation with the WRD faculty.

The Chair leads the department faculty in its development and execution of academic and service policies. For faculty meetings, the Chair (or the Chair's designee) prepares an agenda, circulates it in advance, and presides at all department meetings.

The Chair, in consultation with the faculty and the Steering Committee (as appropriate), is responsible for recommendations on the appointment of new faculty, promotions, reappointments, terminal appointments, post-retirement appointments, the granting of tenure, and decisions not to reappoint.

In consultation with the Steering Committee, the Chair appoints the Director of the Writing Center, the Director of Composition, the Director of Undergraduate Studies, the Director of Graduate Studies, and the chairs of all major committees. The Director appoints committee members in consultation with the committee chairs.

The Chair is responsible for preparing the departmental budget. The Chair shall seek the advice of the Steering Committee prior to forwarding the budget to the Dean. Upon approval of the budget, the Chair is responsible for administering the budget in accordance with University procedures.

As a general practice, the Chair shall seek the advice of members of the department in all matters related to their areas of responsibility. The Department Chair shall seek the advice of the appropriate departmental committees when making administrative decisions that fall under those committees' purview.

All substantial policies and decisions concerning programs and procedures, either academic or executive, shall be referred to the faculty by the Chair for their approval and ratification. However, when the matter demands an immediate response, the Chair is empowered to act without benefit of counsel. In such cases, the Chair must inform the faculty as soon as possible. Staff employees shall be consulted by the Chair, when appropriate, in the development of administrative policies and on decisions that directly affect staff employees.

Evaluation of the administrative performance of the Chair is the responsibility of the College. The Dean's office will conduct an evaluation at regular intervals. This evaluation will include participation by Department faculty and staff.

### **2. Director of Composition** (Tenure-line Faculty position)

The Director of Composition reports to the Chair and supervises the teaching

and assessment of WRD 110, WRD 111, WRD 203, and WRD 204. The Director of Composition oversees textbook selection; hiring, training, and supervision of mentors and instructors; student grievances; and transfer equivalency policy. The Director works closely with his or her counterpart in the Department of Instructional Communication (College of CIS) to ensure that CIS & WRD 110 & 111 are coordinated effectively. In consultation with the Chair, the Director works closely with the Vice-Provost for Undergraduate Education, the Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences for Undergraduate Education on General Education matters, and the Director of the Writing Center. The term of the Director of Composition is three years, renewable.

### **3. Director of the Writing Center** (Faculty position)

The Director of the Writing Center serves the University at large in providing tutoring for writing, speaking, and visual design. The Director hires, trains, and supervises all consultants who serve in the Center. The Director of the Writing Center reports to the Chair of WRD and works closely with the Director of Composition.

### **4. Director of Undergraduate Studies** (Faculty position)

The DUS oversees the development of undergraduate degrees and certificates and chairs the Undergraduate Studies Committee. The DUS is appointed by the Department Chair. The DUS works closely with the Department Manager, the College of Arts and Sciences, and other units within the University as appropriate. The DUS is responsible for preparing reports and requests for information concerning the undergraduate program, advising students, creating the schedule of courses for undergraduate degrees, tracking student placement, and working with the Department Manager and Department Chair to assign courses to faculty. The term of the DUS is two years, renewable.

### **5. Director of Graduate Studies** (Future tenured faculty position)

The DGS oversees the development of a graduate program and chairs the Graduate Studies Committee. When a graduate program is approved, the Department Chair recommends the DGS to the Graduate Dean, who makes the appointment. The DGS is responsible to both the Graduate Dean and the Department for supervision of the graduate program. The DGS recruits new graduate students, advises graduate students, tracks student placement, and maintains proper and up-to-date records of all correspondence between graduate students, the Department, and the Graduate School. The DGS also develops the schedule of graduate course offerings and approves the assignment of graduate advisors. The term of the DGS is two years, renewable.

## **Section 3: Meeting Procedures**

**A. Principles.** The Department reaches administrative decisions in a number of ways, including by vote in Department meetings, by vote in committees, and by the actions of administrators. We follow the general principle that the more important

the matter to be decided, the more widespread and inclusive the deliberation about it should be. The Department highly values open discussion as a means by which to reach decisions.

The voting membership of the Department has the power to determine the by-laws of the department, the undergraduate and graduate curriculum, the hiring and promotion of faculty, and other matters of policy and procedure brought to the voting membership by the Department Chair. This power may be delegated to and administered by the officers and committees specified in Article I, Section 2 of these bylaws.

## **B. Department Meetings**

**1. Scheduling and Attendance.** The full Department meets at least once per month during the academic year. Meetings will be set during a time that does not conflict with faculty teaching schedules. All faculty members are expected to attend. Regularly scheduled meetings will be set by the Chair at the beginning of the semester. At the discretion of the Chair, last-minute meetings may be called, ideally during a time that does not conflict with faculty teaching schedules.

**2. Agenda and Minutes.** In consultation with the Steering Committee, the Chair will set an agenda to be distributed in advance of each meeting. Minutes will be taken at every meeting and will be available to the faculty at the next meeting.

**3. Voting Procedures.** A majority of the voting membership constitutes a quorum. Robert's Rules of Order will govern the voting procedures (but not meeting procedures) during Department meetings. Normally, voting on a departmental issue will not take place unless the issue is indicated on the agenda. Except where written ballots are required by other regulations, decisions are by voice vote. Voting by proxy is not allowed. Any member present may request a secret ballot for personnel matters or especially contentious issues.

## **Section 4: Committees**

**A. Composition of Committees.** Whenever possible, standing committees will have representation from Full-Time Lecturers as well as Tenure-Track Faculty. Committee chairs will receive a charge from the Department Chair each fall. Committee chairs will report regularly to the Steering Committee and as needed to the Department as a whole. Committee members normally serve a two-year term (first year staggered). The Department Chair will set up ad-hoc committees and/or task forces as necessary to support the Department's, College's, and University's mission and vision.

## **B. Committee Meetings**

**1. Scheduling and Attendance.** Committees do the work of the Department,

and so all committee members are expected not only to attend but also to contribute to the work of the committee to which they were elected/appointed. Regularly scheduled meetings will be set by the Committee chair at the beginning of the semester during a time that does not conflict with committee members' teaching/class schedules. At the discretion of the Committee chair, last-minute meetings may be called, ideally during a time that does not conflict with faculty teaching schedules.

**2. Agenda and Minutes.** Committee chairs do not need to set a formal agenda, but should inform Committee members of the focus of the meetings. Members will rotate duties taking notes and publishing meeting minutes. Committee chairs will assume responsibility for ensuring that the work of their committee is completed in a timely, ethical, and effective way.

**3. Voting Procedures.** A majority of the Committee membership constitutes a quorum. Normally, Robert's Rules of Order will not govern Committee meetings, but can be invoked by any member present to govern voting procedures. Except where written ballots are required by other regulations, decisions are by voice vote. Voting by proxy is not allowed.

### C. Standing Committees

**1. Steering Committee.** The Steering Committee is chaired by the Department Chair. Half of the membership is elected by the Department membership as follows: one tenure-track faculty member and one full-time lecturer. The Department Chair appoints one tenure-track faculty member and one full-time lecturer in order to ensure balance on the Committee. The Steering Committee deliberates on educational policy, hiring priorities, curriculum, promotions and reviews, and other matters of policy and procedure brought to the Committee by the Department Chair. Minutes from the Steering Committee are kept by the Assistant to the Director of the Department.

**2. Graduate Committee.** When graduate programs are approved, the Graduate Committee will consist of the Director of Graduate Studies, two tenure-track faculty, one full-time lecturer, and one graduate student. The Graduate Committee oversees admissions, curriculum, and policy for graduate programs of the Department.

**3. Undergraduate Studies Committee.** The Undergraduate Studies Committee consists of the Director of Undergraduate Studies, one tenure-track faculty, one full-time lecturer, and one undergraduate student. The Committee oversees the BA in Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies and any minor or certificate programs that may arise.

### Section 5: Advisory Boards

The Department will also seek regular input and guidance from the following advisory groups:

Proposal for a Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies

**A. Student Advisory Board.** The Student Advisory Board should be composed primarily of WRD majors and minors who meet at least once per semester to offer input about the Department’s curriculum, events, student groups, and its overall goals. The Advisory Board may also plan events in support of the Department’s goals. This advisory board will be chaired by a Full-Time Lecturer or Tenure-Track faculty member.

**B. Community Advisory Board.** The Community Advisory Board will be composed of local community members representing non-profit groups, employers, and laypeople committed to the Department’s goals. This Advisory Board will give the Department input and guidance on ways its curriculum and events can help promote the development of an informed, engaged citizenry locally and throughout the Commonwealth and ways the Department can support the needs of employers, community groups, and everyday people as writers, communicators, and thinkers. This advisory board will be co-chaired by a Full-Time Lecturer or Tenure-Track faculty member and a community member.

## **Section 6: Amendment of By-laws**

Any proposed amendments to these bylaws must be advertised and circulated in writing to all Department members at least one week prior to their consideration. Amendments and additions are approved by a two-thirds majority of all voting faculty.

## **Article II: Hiring, Review, Promotion and Tenure of Lecturers and Faculty**

### **Section 1: Hiring Procedures**

**A. Hiring Priorities.** The Steering Committee establishes hiring priorities for all faculty positions and makes recommendations on a hiring plan to the full Department for discussion and approval by a simple majority vote. The Chair also seeks input and approval for the hiring plan from the College of Arts and Science.

**B. Hiring Committee.** Once a search has been approved by the College, the Department chair appoints a Search Committee comprised of representatives of all Department constituents—tenured and tenure-track faculty, lecturers, staff, and, when appropriate, a graduate student representative. The Search Committee drafts the job description; reviews applicants' dossiers and writing samples; selects a short list of candidates; conducts initial interviews at appropriate professional conferences or via video conferencing, and recommends finalists for campus visits. The finalists' application materials will be available to all Department faculty.

**C. Recruiting.** While the Search Committee assumes most of the recruiting responsibilities, all members of the Department are encouraged to identify highly qualified applicants and to encourage them to apply.

**D. Campus Visits.** Finalists' dossiers will be made available to all members of the faculty and staff prior to campus visits. Every member of the Department is expected to participate fully in finalists' visits—attending candidates' job talks, Q&A sessions, or other informal meetings—to supplement information gained from the dossier review. All Department members, graduate students, adjunct faculty, and affiliate faculty will be invited to share their impressions about the finalists with the Search Committee in writing. Based on these recommendations and their own assessment, the Search Committee will make hiring recommendations at a meeting of all Department members.

**E. Voting Procedures.** A meeting to discuss the finalists will be announced at least a week in advance to the Department membership and is held at a time that does not conflict with members' teaching schedules. There will be two kinds of votes taken at this meeting: 1) a vote on the acceptability of each candidate, and 2) a vote on their ranking. The Search Committee's recommendation on these two votes comes to the floor as a seconded motion. If in a simple majority vote the motion should fail on either of these motions, the Department members will vote on the acceptability and ranking of each candidate through paper ballot.

## **Section 2: Guidelines for Appointment, Review, Promotion and Tenure: Professors**

### **A. Receipt of Tenure**

Faculty members earning tenure in the Department will have contributed to the mission and needs of the department. To achieve tenure, they must demonstrate a significant, sustained contribution to their discipline, Department, College, and University.

Assistant professors earning tenure will have a strong record of successful (1) research and publication and (2) teaching, as well as an appropriate level of (3) service activity. Candidates seeking tenure will provide evidence of achievement in each of these three basic areas of performance. Substantial achievement in both research and teaching, and indications of future excellence in these categories, are necessary for tenure; because of the mission of WRD, local citizenship is also expected. An outstanding record in any one of these three categories alone is insufficient for tenure.

**1. Research.** From the time of appointment, candidates for tenure must demonstrate a strong commitment to research and publication in the areas of writing studies, rhetoric studies, and/or digital media studies. We also recognize scholarly work presented in digital media (e.g., video production, digital installations) as contributing to WRD's mission under the category of research/creative activity. Because of the nature of the field, scholarship that focuses on learning and pedagogy (especially of writing) and results in traditional categories of research (peer-reviewed publications, conference presentations, and

invited lectures and workshops) is valued the same as other research in similar categories. Also relevant are substantial external grants for projects that will contribute to knowledge in the field. Collaborative authorship is recognized as an established practice for scholarship in our field, and on-line publications are recognized as important and will be judged on their merit (e.g., peer-review, low acceptance rates, and level of prestige). It is important to emphasize that publications in new outlets count the same as publications in established ones. Finally, the Department rewards innovative uses of new media and recognizes that some important work is not peer-reviewed in the usual ways. In such cases, ex post reviews of such work by highly regarded scholars chosen by the Department can be submitted as evidence of merit.

Scholarly publications or activities include but are not necessarily limited to the following:

- Book-length publications, including traditional academic or creative publications, textbooks, co-authored work, translations, special editions)
- Digital projects
- Databases
- Peer-reviewed articles in print or online
- Other articles or essays
- Book reviews
- Grants
- Editing (special issues, etc.)
- Visiting lectures at other universities
- Keynote addresses (local or national)
- Peer-reviewed conference presentations
- Other conference presentations
- Workshops or other special events
- University presentations
- Peer reviews (of grants and other submissions)
- Editorial boards
- Other work on professional organizations in support of original research and creative activity

Tenure and promotion in WRD are awarded to faculty who produce significant scholarship that represents a cohesive, long-term scholarly project or agenda. Typically, candidates for tenure will be expected to present to reviewers evidence of sustained, scholarly achievement in one of two forms: (1) a book published in a reputable scholarly press or (2) a series of scholarly articles in peer-reviewed journals, along with other evidences. The Department also recognizes major digital work that represents substantial, original research as a possible centerpiece of a promotion and tenure case. Whether a faculty member presents a scholarly monograph, a collaborative book, a series of published articles, or a digital project as the major evidence

of her or his scholarly achievement, that work must be peer-reviewed and the candidate should be able to demonstrate its value to the broader discipline and/or to trans-disciplinary conversations connected to rhetoric and composition. Junior faculty pursuing digital scholarship as the centerpiece of their tenure and promotion case must be able to demonstrate the value of their projects as scholarship, no matter what the venue or medium. In the case of digital scholarship, candidates will be required to demonstrate the value of the venues and media in which they publish and that the scope and rigor of the project(s) are comparable to that of a book or series of articles. Engagement with scholarship in the faculty member's field or sub-disciplinary areas, scope and/or originality of the scholarly argument, and innovative scholarly methods are among the ways a candidate can demonstrate the scholarly value of the work.

The Department recognizes co-authored books as equally viable evidence of scholarly achievement when (1) the book exhibits the scope, rigor, and quality that outstanding single authored books, and (2) when the candidate can clearly present his or her role in the collaboration.

2. **Teaching.** Candidates for tenure must demonstrate achievement in teaching in a variety of ways, which can be adapted according to each instructor's strengths, innovations, and involvement in the department.

**The following teaching materials are required:**

- Syllabi from every semester under review
- Student evaluations from every semester under review, when available. These will be collected electronically by the Department and will be made available to the senior faculty.
- A Statement of Teaching that details philosophy of teaching, successes, experiments (both successful and unsuccessful), and innovations. The Statement could also include curriculum development, classroom activities, teaching goals, efforts to promote student learning both inside and outside the classroom, comments from student evaluations, effective teaching methodologies, notable achievements in instruction, and other initiatives related to teaching.
- Numeric student evaluation of "Overall value of the course" and "Overall quality of teaching" for each course taught at the University of Kentucky.
- Peer classroom observations for each year in a tenure-track position at the University of Kentucky with a one-page written evaluation.
- Participation in or facilitation of teaching workshops
- Mentoring and/or advising students
- Leadership of or participation in curricular reform efforts



**The following categories are optional:**

- Teaching awards
- Examples of student success (publications, awards, projects, etc.)
- Unsolicited letters or emails from students about your teaching/mentoring
- Development of service learning or internship opportunities for students

**3. Service**

The candidate will also write a “Statement of Service” that describes service to the department, the College, the University, the profession, and the community. These activities may include (but are not limited to) any of the following:

- Offices held in local or national professional organizations
- Reviews (institutional or individual, e.g., promotion and tenure reviews)
- Committee work
- Organizing events on campus
- Securing grants for community work
- Offering workshops
- Curriculum development
- Participation in orientation and new instructor mentoring
- Cross-departmental endeavors
- Participation in college-wide initiatives (e.g., certificate programs, summer programs)
- Outreach to K-12
- Community outreach

**C. Promotion to Full Professor**

Faculty members who wish to be promoted to full professor in the Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies are expected to contribute to the mission and needs of the Department. To achieve promotion, they must demonstrate a significant, sustained contribution to their discipline, Department, College, and University, earn a national or even international reputation for their work, and have a strong, sustained record of successful (1) research and publication, (2) teaching, and (3) service activities. Candidates for promotion will provide evidence of achievement in each of these three basic areas of performance.

Typically, candidates for promotion to the rank of Professor will be expected to present to reviewers evidence of sustained, scholarly achievement beyond the material considered for their previous promotion in one of three forms: (1) a book published in a reputable scholarly press, (2) a series of scholarly articles in peer-reviewed journals, or (3) a major digital project, along with other evidences, in each

case. The Department also recognizes that in some cases, an associate professor may earn a national reputation for extraordinary achievements in the area of administration or community outreach. In the area of administration, the candidate will offer evidence of extraordinary achievement in leadership within the University of Kentucky. In the area of community outreach, the candidate will offer evidence of extraordinary achievement for work that connects the university with the community. The candidate must continue to provide evidence of ongoing, sustained outstanding research, teaching and advising, service and outreach, and good citizenship within the Department regardless of the primary category for promotion.

### **Section 3: Guidelines for Appointment, Review and Promotion: Lecturers**

#### **A. Appointment**

Candidates for appointment to the position of Lecturer or Senior Lecturer must hold the MFA or PhD degree.

#### **B. Reappointment**

##### **1. Reappointment Process**

Deliberations about Lecturer reappointment, nonrenewal, and promotion to Senior Lecturer take place in the Spring semester of each year. The Steering Committee will conduct the reviews. Lecturers will submit materials in mid-March, and will be notified by April 15<sup>th</sup> of the decision of the Department.

##### **2. Reappointment Decision**

The Lecturer or Senior Lecturer will be *reappointed* if he or she has shown evidence of teaching excellence as evidenced by the teaching materials gathered as part of the FMER process and any additional information available to the Department such as information gained through classroom observation. The candidate for reappointment will also have a record of excellence in the performance of any assigned nonteaching responsibilities and good citizenship in WRD.

##### **3. Nonrenewal of Appointment**

The Lecturer or Senior Lecturer on an initial one-year appointment will receive a *nonrenewal of appointment* if he or she has failed to perform well as a teacher (or in his or her nonteaching responsibilities) in the first year as evidenced by the materials gathered as part of the FMER process and any additional information available to the Department such as information gained through classroom observation.

##### **4. Terminal Reappointment**

The Lecturer or Senior Lecturer on a two-year appointment will receive a *terminal reappointment* if he or she has persistently failed to perform well as a teacher (or in his or her nonteaching responsibilities) as evidenced by the materials gathered as part of the FMER process and any additional information available to the Department such as information gained through classroom observation. The

terminal reappointment is for one year.

### **C. Promotion to the Rank of Senior Lecturer**

In order to advance to the rank of Senior Lecturer, a Lecturer will have received a Ph.D. or MFA and demonstrated excellence in teaching at the University of Kentucky for at least five years. In addition, the lecturer will have a record of excellence in the performance of any assigned nonteaching responsibilities. To prepare for promotion review, the Lecturer will prepare a portfolio that provides evidence of achievement in teaching, service, and, if applicable, professional development. These materials can be drawn from the FMER portfolio.

#### **1. Teaching**

The teaching portfolio should demonstrate teaching effectiveness in a variety of ways, which can be adapted according to each instructor's strengths, innovations, and involvement in the department.

##### **The following teaching materials are required:**

- Syllabi from every semester under review
- Student evaluations from every semester under review, when available. These will be collected electronically by the Department and will be made available in full to all reviewers (i.e., no action is required).
- A self-reflective statement addressing teaching philosophy and instructional achievements across the period of review, including innovations and proposed new curricula. The discussion may also include efforts to promote student learning both inside and outside the classroom, comments from student evaluations, effective teaching methodologies, notable achievements in instruction, and other initiatives related to teaching.
- Numeric student evaluation of "Overall value of the course" and "Overall quality of teaching" for each course taught during the review period.
- Peer classroom observations for each year in a Lecturer position at the University of Kentucky with a one-page written evaluation.

##### **The following teaching materials are optional:**

- Teaching awards
- Examples of student success (publications, awards, projects, etc.)
- Letters or emails from students
- Participation in or facilitation of teaching workshops
- Evidence of pedagogical community engagement (e.g., service learning)
- Mentoring and/or advising students

#### **2. Service**

In a written Statement of Service, a lecturer will describe service to the

department, the university, and the community. These activities may include (but are not limited to) any of the following:

- Committee work
- Organizing events on campus or in the community
- Securing grants
- Offering workshops
- Curriculum development
- Participation in orientation and new instructor mentoring
- Cross-departmental involvement
- Participation in college-wide initiatives (e.g., certificate programs, summer programs)
- Participation in national conversations about pedagogy (e.g., conferences, papers, symposia)
- Outreach to K-12
- Continuing education outreach (e.g., the Carnegie Center)

### **3. Professional Development (if applicable)**

In a written Statement of Professional Development, a lecturer will describe professional development, creative activity, and/or scholarly activity. Publications and conference papers may be submitted along with the statement as evidence. These activities may include (but are not limited to) any of the following:

- Participation in national conversations related to the field(s) (e.g., conferences, papers, symposia)
- Multi-media projects
- Digital humanities projects and initiatives
- Publications and/or other creative works contributing to the mission of the Department

### **D. Appeals**

To appeal a Promotion or Reappointment denial, a Lecturer may write a narrative explanation detailing how some aspect of the Promotion Portfolio may have been overlooked or undervalued. The Portfolio and the narrative appeal will then be sent back to the Steering Committee for a second review.

## **PERSONNEL ASSOCIATED WITH WRD**

The Division of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies currently employs 15.25 FTE faculty (9.25 tenure-line faculty and 6 lecturers) and 2 staff members.

All of the faculty and staff in WRD are officially appointed in the Department of English. They have permission by English to move into a separate department (see Appendix, Jeffery Clymer letter). These members include:

#### Faculty & Credentials

Rank	Name
Lecturers	Joshua Abboud. PhD, Rhetorics, Communication, and Information Design, Clemson University. Elizabeth Connors-Manke. PhD, English, University of Kentucky. Katherine Rogers-Carpenter. PhD, English, University of Kentucky. Brandy Scalise. PhD, Rhetoric and Composition, Penn State University.
Senior Lecturers	Thomas Marksbury. PhD, English, University of Kentucky. Judith Gatton Prats. Writing Center Director. MA, English, University of Kentucky.
Assistant Professors	Steven Alvarez. PhD, English, CUNY Graduate Center. William Endres. Assistant Professor. PhD, Rhetoric and Linguistics, Arizona State University. Brian McNely. PhD, Rhetoric and Writing Studies, University of Texas, El Paso. Jim Ridolfo. PhD, Rhetoric and Writing, Michigan State University.
Associate Professors	Janice Fernheimer. Director, Jewish Studies. PhD, English, University of Texas, Austin. Roxanne Mountford. PhD, Rhetoric and Composition, Ohio State University. Jenny Rice. Director of Composition. PhD, English, University of Texas, Austin. Randall Roorda. PhD, English Education, University of Michigan. (.25 FTE)
Full Professors	Adam Banks. Division Director. PhD, Rhetoric and Composition, Penn State University. Jeff Rice. Martha B. Reynolds Endowed Professor and co-director, Wired. PhD, English, University of Florida.

\*Currently under review for tenure & promotion

\*\*Currently under review for promotion to full professor

#### Staff & Credentials

Rank	Name
Program Manager	Deborah Kirkman. Associate Director of Composition. MA, English, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
Staff Associate II	Georgia Diane Robertson. BA, Eastern Kentucky University.

## PROPOSAL DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

In August 2009, Roxanne Mountford and Associate Dean Ted Schatzki brought to the then new Dean Mark Kornbluh the final report of the CCRWU, commissioned by Interim Dean Phil Harling and Provost Kumble Subbaswamy and chaired by then Dean of the College of Communications and Information Studies, J. David Johnson. The Committee had agreed unanimously that different writing units on campus (namely, the Writing Program, Writing Center, and Writing Initiative) should be merged into one unit; the majority agreed that this new unit should not be a mere service unit in the university but rather a department with degrees and a research mission. Mountford and Schatzki also presented Kornbluh with the new General Education Proposal that had been passed in principle by the University Senate in May 2009 and called for the development of an interdisciplinary Composition and Communication Program. New funding was required both to build the C&C Program and to respond to the recommendations of the CCRWU. In Fall 2009, Kornbluh authorized a hiring plan for an appropriate unit that would at first be housed in English.

That unit became the Division of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies. In March 2010, Kornbluh appointed Mountford as the Division's founding director and authorized WRD to begin reporting directly to the College for budget and hiring requests. Mountford, who had been Writing Program Director (one of the three units consolidated into the Division), was charged with developing undergraduate and graduate degrees in writing, rhetoric, and digital media; she was also given many of the responsibilities of a department chair, including developing separate governance systems, hiring, and proposing and managing a budget. She also served as a liaison between English and WRD on tenure and promotion, reappointment reviews, and faculty merit evaluations for WRD personnel, which are technically conducted by English. The Writing Center Director, Director of Composition, Director of Undergraduate Studies, and two staff members now reported to Mountford. The responsibilities of the Writing Initiative Director were later transferred to WRD, though the Writing Initiative itself had been dissolved.

In August 2010, the Dean and the Department of English gave WRD permission to seek departmental status if they wished to do so, and in September 2010, the faculty in WRD voted to seek departmental status. The faculty decided that the next step was to develop a BA/BS, since the expertise of the faculty was not being fully utilized by teaching and administering general education courses and the few undergraduate courses in writing that rhetoric and composition faculty in English had previously developed.

The BA/BS was passed by the College of A&S's Educational Policy Committee in Spring 2012 and is now with the University Senate. Guidelines and procedures for the merit review of faculty and lecturers were unanimously approved by the faculty in Fall 2011. The Steering Committee also designed WRD's Mission Statement and By-laws, and the faculty passed the final version on March 6, 2012. This Proposal represents the research and efforts of both the WRD Steering Committee and the College of A&S.

## TIMELINE FOR KEY EVENTS IN PROPOSED CHANGE

As reported throughout this proposal, many of the proposed changes that will be needed for WRD to become a department have already been accomplished. A summary (Table 3) is presented below.

TABLE 3: Timeline for Proposed Reorganization

Semester	Events
<b>Spring 2010</b>	Division Director appointed; 5 faculty, 2 lecturers, and 1 postdoctoral scholar hired
<b>Fall 2010</b>	English and College of A&S give permission for WRD to become new department; WRD votes to become new department. WRD teaches pilot sections of UK Core Composition & Communication.
<b>Spring 2011</b>	WRD hires 2 new lecturers. Begins work on governance documents and undergraduate degree. Pilots new undergraduate courses.
<b>Fall 2011</b>	WRD is granted a separate budget. 65 TA lines appointed to WRD, allowing WRD to continue to support MA and PhD students in English as well as qualified graduate students from other departments. Writing Center begins reporting to WRD. New Writing Center Director appointed. WRD pilots more new undergraduate courses and continues work on governance and degrees. C&C curriculum begins.
<b>Spring 2012</b>	WRD proposes new BA/BS. College of A&S approves BA/BS. WRD passes By-Laws. WRD hires two new tenure-line faculty. WRD begins reviewing GWR courses. More new undergraduate courses piloted.
<b>Fall 2012</b>	WRD submits proposal for Department Status. WRD begins work on graduate degree(s).
<b>Spring 2013</b>	WRD BA/BS approved.
<b>Fall 2013</b>	WRD becomes a Department. First WRD Chair appointed.

## FINANCIAL VIABILITY OF PROPOSED UNIT

The College of A&S and the Division of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies do not anticipate that any additional costs will be incurred by creating a Department of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies. It is also worth adding that the current WRD faculty is sufficient to support our current responsibilities as well as the proposed undergraduate degrees. Based on current projected major figures, WRD faculty will need to teach a total of 7 WRD courses (200-level and above) per semester in the first year of the program for majors (and not including students from other disciplines who expect to take our courses). WRD already teaches a minimum of 10 sections per semester and can support as many as 25 sections with existing faculty. All WRD faculty will continue to teach 100-level courses. Lecturers teach a minimum of 4 WRD 110 or 111 courses per year; tenure-line faculty teach a minimum of 1 WRD 110 or 111 course per year (most teach 2). We also have sufficient faculty to support the Writing Center and the management of the Graduation Writing Requirement.

WRD already has dedicated professional and support staff. No additional staff is needed for a new undergraduate degree program.

WRD 110 and 111 courses have course fees attached, and these additional revenues are earmarked for the UK Core courses to cover equipment costs and technological-consumables attendant to those lower-division courses.

The Department of English and WRD have reorganized, grouping all WRD faculty and staff on the 13<sup>th</sup> floor of Patterson Office Tower, with separate copy rooms and storage space. Funds will be budgeted to make minor changes to three individual faculty offices to create a main office and chair's office (the 13<sup>th</sup> floor does not have main office space). The Writing Center continues to serve students and faculty across campus from its home in William T. Young Library.

In short, the funding and facilities needed for a Department of WRD have already been established. (See Appendix for letter from Mark Kornbluh, Dean of A&S.)

## EVIDENCE OF SUPPORT

The Department of English and the College of A&S support this proposal (see letters from the Chair of English, Jeffery Clymer, and Dean Mark Kornbluh in the Appendix). The College has played a key role in consolidating the writing units now housed in WRD, providing direct reporting lines to the Dean, facilitating the migration of faculty in WRD to the 13<sup>th</sup> floor, establishing a separate budget, and hiring WRD faculty. English has supported WRD's efforts to build an undergraduate degree, transferring several English courses to WRD. Finally, in August 2010, English voted to allow WRD to seek department status, a vote that was recently reaffirmed.

## PROPOSAL'S IMPACT ON CURRENT AND FUTURE STUDENTS

In the Justification section above, we explain why this proposal will have a positive impact on current and future students. With the ability to hire and promote specialists in rhetoric and composition, WRD will ensure that University of Kentucky graduates can write and design effective arguments in the digital age. We will do so by producing our own graduates, by providing robust coursework to students in other majors, and by supplementing in-class instruction across the curriculum through the UK Writing Center, which we staff with writing and digital media specialists (including faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate peer tutors). Because our unit also provides leadership on writing instruction across campus, we impact current and future students by influencing educational policy. Our complete proposal for a BA/BS in Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies further supports claims about the value of a degree in our area of disciplinary expertise (see Appendix).

WRD faculty have already begun recruiting students into experimental sections of our new courses through internal advertising and announcements at events we sponsor (e.g., the



Undergraduate Writing Symposium). We will not begin advertising and outreach within the Commonwealth until the BA/BS in WRD is formally approved.

While it is premature to discuss how this proposal will impact graduate students, we have affirmed in several meetings that our first effort will be to establish a professional degree (either a terminal MA/MS) that will prepare graduate students for employment requiring advanced skills in professional writing, document design, and digital production. Such a degree would be unique in the Commonwealth and provide students with access to an employment sector currently underserved by Kentucky universities.

## ASSESSMENT

As we note in the History section above, the CCRWU offered five compelling reasons to consolidate the Writing Program, the Writing Center, and the Writing Initiative into a single department. We consider these to be our first strategic goals:

- 1) A coherent structural approach to writing instruction
- 2) A one-stop shop for end-users and central identity on campus
- 3) One unit, with a clear leader, and more direct access to higher administration
- 4) Greater flexibility in meeting the needs of different colleges
- 5) A coherent approach to training writing instructors.

To these we would add:

- 6) New degrees that offer cutting-edge approaches to conceiving and teaching writing and rhetoric in the digital age
- 7) Graduates for the Commonwealth empowered to write and compose (using digital media and visuals) effectively for audiences of all kinds.

Because the writing units on campus have already been consolidated, we can offer preliminary assessment on items #1-5 above.

*Goal #1: Provide a coherent structural approach to writing instruction.*

In 2009-10, the newly created Division of Writing, Rhetoric, and Digital Studies helped lead curriculum reform in the teaching of writing and public speaking, creating the Composition and Communication Program with the Division of Instructional Communication in the College of Communication and Information. The core value underlying this program is that instruction in “composing” and “communicating” should be consolidated so that students make connections among the rhetorical principles involved in writing, speaking, and designing visuals. That we should recognize our colleagues in Communication as our close allies in this effort was another core value. Our first major achievement was the successful *cross-college creation of the Composition and Communication Program*, including interdisciplinary training of faculty and teaching assistants in 2010 and 2011. In this way, we achieved a coherent approach to the training of writing instructors. With a separate budget, WRD began employing more graduate teaching assistants from other disciplines, including History,

Communication, and Philosophy, which has extended our pedagogical influence beyond our original borders.

*Goal #2: Provide a one-stop shop for end-users and central identity on campus.*

*Goal #5: Provide a coherent approach to training writing instructors.*

Our second major achievement was a strategic alignment of the Writing Center with the goals of WRD. The Writing Center created a new web presence and began offering tutoring and workshops in the strategic use of visuals and multimedia in composing in support of the new Composition and Communication curriculum. We hired Rachel Elliott, an instructor who holds the MFA in Fine Arts and has experience teaching visual design to undergraduates, to offer these courses and to reconstruct the Writing Center web pages. The Writing Center increased its hours, began employing more faculty and teaching assistants, and added digital cameras and computer graphics programs to its overall resources. The Writing Center served more than 2,000 students and staff last year. In the first month of the Fall 2012 semester, the Writing Center's preliminary data show that we will more than double those numbers in the 2012-13 academic year. The new organizational structure has therefore benefitted the entire university community by expanding the reach of the Writing Center as a resource for multimodal composition across the curriculum.

Despite the CCRWU's report, the Graduation Writing Requirement's (GWR) Tier Two plan was revised by an Undergraduate Council subcommittee without representation from WRD. Following a negative review in Senate Council of this subcommittee's proposal, the WRD Director, Roxanne Mountford, worked with then Associate Provost Michael Mullen to revise the proposal. The first proposal had removed further instruction in writing as a requirement; the new proposal requires writing plus either oral presentation or visual presentation to be taught in the undergraduate major. This proposal should go forward in Senate Council in Fall 2012. In the meantime, WRD has assumed the role of reviewing GWR courses and has, since Fall 2011, been reviewing transfer equivalencies for the GWR. Because the GWR was administered from the Provost's Office, there has been a delay in the consolidation of this work under WRD. However, the response of the Senate Council to the revised GWR allowed WRD to assume intellectual leadership of what once was the Writing Initiative. With this recent change, WRD has finally become a one-stop-shop for end-users.

*Goal #3: Establish one unit, with a clear leader, and more direct access to higher administration*

One of the most important shifts in WRD's status within A&S has been the elevation of the WRD Director to the Council of Chairs. In this role, Roxanne Mountford has been able to bring visibility to WRD's work and to assume a leadership role within the University, including service on the Provost's Committee on Budget Metrics. WRD was granted an endowed chair position for the recruitment of Jeff Rice, who has become a co-director of Wired, the residential college for A&S, and the key leader in the digital innovation attendant to this project. Jenny Rice has assumed a leadership role on the UK Core Oversight Committee. Bill Endres is serving on a Faculty Advisory Board for UK IT. Finally, Adam Banks has become important to university-community relations, creating digitally-mediated outreach programs in the African-American communities in and around Lexington.

In these ways, WRD is already assuming a clear leadership role at UK in the teaching of writing and in the realignment of writing for employment in the twenty-first century. Our connection with upper administration includes direct reporting/service to A&S and service on committees administered by the President's and Provost's offices.

*Goal #4: Greater flexibility in meeting the needs of different colleges.*

The CCRWU also recognized that in an independent department, faculty devoted to writing studies would likely provide better support in the teaching of writing to other disciplines. In fact, WRD continues to be the primary unit to offer UK Core and GWR courses. However, with the ability to make new hires, WRD successfully recruited a specialist in workplace writing (Brian McNely), who will guide us in our development of our business writing, technical writing, and new professional writing courses. With expansion of courses in these areas, WRD will be able to provide more specialized writing courses to STEM and B&E majors.

Finally, we have organized and proposed new degrees that offer cutting-edge approaches to teaching writing and rhetoric in the digital age. These degrees, if approved, will provide graduates for the Commonwealth who are fully prepared to write and compose effectively (using digital media and visuals) for audiences of all kinds. (See Appendix for the full BA/BS Proposal.)

As we have argued throughout this proposal, WRD has achieved these preliminary goals in its current liminal position as a semi-autonomous unit. Departmental status will provide us with even greater visibility within the institution and capacity to meet our strategic goals.

## ACCREDITATION AND OTHER IMPLICATIONS OF REORGANIZATION

This reorganization primarily impacts units within the College of A&S. The Writing Center and the functions associated with the Writing Initiative have already been consolidated within WRD in its current status as a Division.

Implications for accreditation by SACS are negligible. Some faculty credentialing work will be re-directed to this new department rather than the Department of English, and one new strategic plan will be required.

## CONCLUSION

It is an opportune moment for the University of Kentucky to found a department focused on writing, rhetoric, and digital studies. State and federal support of public universities is in decline, challenging all scholarly disciplines to align their research, teaching, and outreach with issues of local, national, and global concern. The discipline of rhetoric is more relevant than ever before, helping citizens understand now as in antiquity how to make their case with civility and grace. Rhetoric and composition, the contemporary expression of this

ancient field, moves the principles of rhetoric into twenty-first century contexts, where writing and multimedia are ubiquitous. Providing a departmental home for this discipline gives shelter to writing services at the University of Kentucky while advancing the study and practice of writing, rhetoric, and digital media in the Commonwealth. For all these reasons, we ask that our proposal be approved.