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Executive Summary

This report is the third phase of a process that reviews Rice's current approach to the teaching of essential writing and communication skills at the undergraduate and graduate level and recommends improvements:

Phase 1: Fall 2010 Senate Working Group on Communication in the Curriculum; Evaluate writing support, COMM 103 problems, recommend next steps

Phase 2: Spring 2010 faculty advisory group formed; external reviews by writing center directors from Northwestern, Rutgers, MIT; recommendations for next steps

Phase 3: Fall 2011 new Senate Working Group on Communication in the Curriculum

Charge: “develop final recommendations that address the immediate-term problems with COMM 103 within a framework of longer-term changes that will provide Rice students with the means to develop their writing and communication skills at a level that is competitive with that at peer institutions.”

Proposal: Establish a new, stand-alone Program in Writing and Communication, with three components:

1. a required first-year writing-intensive seminar;

2. a Center for Written, Oral, and Visual Communication that will support teaching and learning through workshops, tutoring, and noncredit courses for undergraduate and graduate students as well as faculty;

3. an upper-level communication in the discipline component that departments will develop over the next three years; implementation is contingent upon provision of adequate resources to the Center for the support of this component.

Development of guidelines for the creation of the PWC, for oversight of the First Year Writing-intensive Seminars, and for the coordination of the future, upper-level "communication in the discipline" component will be the responsibility of the Faculty Advisory Board, composed of faculty members appointed by the Senate, acting in consultation with the PWC Director.

Current Situation

The only writing requirement for graduation is COMM 103 for students who fail the composition exam (over 30% of incoming freshmen). This remedial approach is at odds with our undergraduate program goal that "our students must be able to speak, write, and present..."
clearly, cogently, and persuasively". Rice lags behind its peers in its institutional commitment to writing: 15 of 16 peer institutions surveyed have active writing/communication centers and require at least one writing course for all undergraduate students; 11 require more than one. Rice's writing center employs 50 undergraduates who serve primarily COMM 103 students; it has no physical location. Undergraduate teaching of writing and communication is uneven across the campus; courses in the disciplines are available mainly for engineering and natural science majors, and business minors. Graduate students and non-native speakers of English receive little writing or communication support.

In response to internal and external reviews, the proposed writing and communication program will capitalize on Rice's existing strengths, particularly its robust student research culture, college system, and proactive approach to technology. The numerous resources already in place – COMM instructors, Cain Project courses as models, existing departmental capstone courses, graduate writing and communication courses in CAAM, BCB, ENGI, and the English Department – can be integrated into the new program

Four-year implementation timeframe for proposed Program (see timeline, p. 24)

Year 1 (by Fall 2012):

A. Creation of Program for Writing and Communication (PWC)

1. Administrative structure:

   a. Director (Interim 2012–2013)

      oversees organization, staffing, implementation of Freshman Writing Seminars;
      Center for Written, Oral, and Visual Communication (see C below);
      Communication in the Discipline requirement (after year 3)

      Search for permanent Director begins Fall 2012; appointment begins Fall 2013

   b. Faculty Advisory Board (FAB) (appointed upon approval of WG proposal) works with
      Director and provides faculty support and oversight for PWC

      Comprises seven voting members (one from each academic school, one from either
      Architecture or Music, a Chair from any school, and one, at-large member)
      appointed by the Senate in consultation with Provost; and two advisory, ex-officio
      members: the Dean of Graduate and Postgraduate Studies or designee; the Dean of
      Undergraduates or designee. Initial FAB should include members from the current
      Working Group in the interest of continuity.
Responsibilities:

c. FAB and Director report to VPAA in Provost's Office

**B. Replace current COMM 103 graduation requirement with First-year Writing-intensive Seminar (FWS) requirement for all undergraduates; FWS are content-based courses with multiple writing and oral presentation assignments; they must be designed to meet the criteria for distribution credit.**

1. Writing composition exam will be replaced by a simpler writing diagnostic exam to identify students needing remedial work in the basic mechanics of writing English before they are likely to succeed in a FWS. Guidelines for assessment will be developed by the FAB.

2. Freshmen Seminars offered in all schools, but concentrated in Humanities – approximately 65 needed, capped at 15 students per course;
   
   a. flexible staffing: contingent faculty including current COMM faculty (now teaching 30+ COMM sections), additional NTT instructors, advanced grad students trained in writing pedagogy, tenure-track faculty (summer workshops available in writing pedagogy)
   
   b. incentives: either salary or teaching assistance from Center staff
   
   c. Guidelines for seminars established by FAB

**C. Establish Center for Written, Oral, and Visual communication**

1. central location, offices for faculty, seminar rooms, carrels for consultation; Fondren 2nd floor space suggested

2. personnel: Director and several assistant directors, distinct from NTT FWS faculty. ESL specialists. Trained undergraduate and graduate peer tutors

3. will provide training, tutors, workshops and support for writing and communication at the undergraduate and graduate levels

**Years 2-4 (By Fall 2015):**

Guidelines and specific undergraduate and graduate curricular requirements for upper level “communication in the discipline” to be developed by departments and programs, in consultation with the FAB and the PWC Director. Many departments already have upper level courses that emphasize professional communication/writing within the discipline. Any expansion of curricular requirements beyond requirements for the major will need Senate approval.
COMMUNICATIONS WORKING GROUP REPORT OUTLINE

CHARGE

In 2010 the Faculty Senate Working Group on Communication in the Curriculum produced a report assessing Rice’s university-wide writing program. That report recommended that Rice conduct an external review that would identify the strengths and weaknesses of our current instructional practices and make recommendations for the creation of a top-tier writing and communication program. As a result of that report, three experts in writing and communication visited Rice in the spring of 2011, reviewed all materials relating to our current program, and met with administrators, faculty, and students. Each of these invited experts issued a separate report. Early this fall, the Senate formed a new working group charged with producing a final report based on the excellent work of our predecessor group and the external reviewers. Our report would, in the language of the charge, “develop final recommendations that address the immediate-term problems with COMM 103 within a framework of longer term changes . . . that will provide Rice students with the means to develop their writing and communication skills at a level that is competitive with that at peer institutions.” Included in the charge was a directive to consult with the Faculty Advisory Group on Communication in the Curriculum which represents, more widely than can the eight-member working group, interests from across the university. The report that follows is our response to that charge and the result of consultations not only with the advisory group but with other stakeholders, including the Dean of Undergraduates, the Dean of Graduate Studies (also the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs), the deans of individual schools, administrators and faculty from the Program for Communication Excellence, writing program administrators from peer institutions, and many others. For the complete text of the earlier reports, see the Faculty Senate site: http://professor.rice.edu/Template_FacultySenate.aspx?id=7089

PROPOSAL

We propose an innovative and vertically integrated communication program in written, oral, and visual communication that takes undergraduate students from their first academic experiences on campus to their more advanced work in their major(s) and provides graduate students with support for professional communication of all kinds. The new Program in Writing and Communication (PWC) is an ambitious one that involves creating new positions, new courses, and new spaces. It also, however, draws on resources already in place while providing a structure that insures their permanence and their integration with each other and with
other parts of the curriculum. The PWC will be a stand-alone program whose director will report to the Provost through the Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs. It will comprise and oversee three components: a required first-year writing and communication experience consisting of a diverse offering of First-Year Writing-intensive Seminars (FWS) across the curriculum; a Center for Written, Oral, and Visual Communication that will support teaching and learning through workshops, consulting, and noncredit courses for faculty and students; and a future upper-level communication component in every discipline that will be developed in consultation with departments and divisions in the next three years. Development of the guidelines for the creation of the PWC, for the oversight of the FWS, and for future upper-level communication in the curriculum courses will be the responsibility of the PWC Director and a Faculty Advisory Board, composed of faculty members appointed by the Faculty Senate (see “Administration and Reporting,” below).

While the plan calls for substantial changes to our current communication program at Rice, the curricular elements—the first-year Writing-intensive Seminars and the future integration of communication into disciplinary offerings—are relatively modest compared to those at some of our peer institutions whose programs are more requirement-intensive. Where we can be leaders in national conversations about communication pedagogy is in our design and implementation of an absolutely top-tier communication center. Because we are starting almost from scratch, we can integrate, more fully than do all but a few of our peers, the oral and visual components of communication. We can also link those components to our increasing number of international initiatives. Our Center for Written, Oral, and Visual Communication can offer a wide range of programs, from short courses on presentation technology, to dissertation workshops, to ESL support. Our Center can be as active as—and even more ambitious than—the exemplary centers at MIT and Stanford.

Ambition requires support at all levels of the faculty and administration. We cannot undertake the many substantive and intellectually serious changes to the program without an assurance that there will be continuous long term financial support for our initiatives. For those elements that involve current tenure-track faculty, we must offer training, support, and incentives. Contingent faculty will also be vital to the success of the program; we must pay them appropriately and support their professional development. If we use graduate students as teachers in some parts of the program, we must make sure that we are offering opportunities for professionally meaningful experiences. These considerations are factored in throughout this document.

The introductory section of this report outlines the current state of communication pedagogy at Rice, articulates a series of principles on which the recommendations are based, and identifies the approaches taken by the committee to frame the report in a way that will address issues of concern to the many stakeholders in this important curricular change. The following sections will describe in some detail each of the components of the proposal. Issues of particular
concern to graduate students as both providers and consumers of communication instruction are addressed in the section on the Center for Written, Oral, and Visual Communication. The report ends with an implementation timeline that we believe addresses what the 2010 report has called the “urgency” of the situation and allows time for university-wide conversation about what might be the less familiar aspects of our proposed program.

INTRODUCTION

THE CURRENT SITUATION

Rice has no writing or communication program that serves all or even a majority of our students. Because we require that students take a writing course only when they fail our composition exam, the majority of undergraduates at Rice, as distinct from their peers at almost every comparable university, are not required to take even one writing or communication-intensive course. We believe that, unfortunately, the structure of the (non)requirement sends the message, even before matriculation, that writing and communication are not central to Rice’s understanding of its educational mission and that writing and communication instruction is simply a form of remedial education.

Many students (typically about 33 percent) do fail the composition exam each year and are required to take COMM 100, “Fundamentals of Academic Communication,” or COMM 103, “Academic Writing and Argument”. Another 40 percent receive a “Low Pass” and are encouraged but not required to take a writing-intensive course. Clearly, all of these students need help with their writing if they are to meet the standard we set for entering students. Of course, the standard we would want to set for graduate students would be much higher. But meeting even high standards is not enough. As we state in the principles below, learning to communicate is not a remedial process; all students, no matter what their skill level, can and should learn to write and to speak more effectively. All students—undergraduate and graduate—deserve the opportunity to enhance their writing and communication skills and the institutional support that makes this possible.

Just as we underserve our students in our first-year offerings, we often fail to provide them opportunities to develop their skills in writing and communication once they choose a major. We do offer some instruction in writing and communication in the disciplines; indeed, there are already in place quite a few innovative courses and initiatives in various aspects of disciplinary writing and communication, some of which we identify as models below (see “Existing Resources”). There are also very few advanced courses in communication outside the academic departments: the COMM program, for example, offers Communication in the Digital Age, Leadership Communication, and Medical Communication to a total of about fifty students. Teachers in Rice’s forensic program also offer rhetoric courses under the auspices of the School of Humanities, but not all of those courses listed in the General Announcements are regularly or frequently taught.

Unlike our peer institutions, Rice does not have a writing center that offers support to the entire student population. Our current Writing Center is funded by the provost’s office as part of
the COMM program, and its services—one-on-one tutoring by undergraduate consultants trained by the COMM staff—are largely directed to first-year students currently enrolled in COMM 103. Because of its lack of staff and resources, the Writing Center can provide very little support for other elements of communication—almost none, for example, for oral communication or visual or digital projects. It also cannot offer programming beyond one-on-one tutoring—workshops, a web site with communication resources, for example—that is routinely offered by Centers at other universities. There is no ongoing communication support for graduate or ESL students. Crucially, the Center has no physical space; consultations take place online, in the colleges, or in public spaces such as Brochstein Pavilion. It is a Center, then, without a center, and exemplifies in its physical marginality the larger issue of the place of writing and communication at Rice.

The number of international undergraduate students has more than doubled in the past five years, making the need for organized ESL instruction at the undergraduate level acute. This year, for the first time, the composition exam was used to identify students having extremely serious mechanical problems with their writing, the majority of them nonnative speakers of English. These students were required for the first time to take COMM 100 before taking COMM 103.

As the internal and external reports make clear, Rice is very much an outlier among its peer institutions when it comes to communication pedagogy. Of the sixteen peer institutions surveyed in the 2010 Working Group report, fifteen require at least one writing course for all undergraduate students, regardless of their degree of proficiency as writers. Eleven universities require more than one; Emory requires four. Seven of the sixteen universities have an advanced-writing requirement (see appendix A). Almost all offer writing-intensive courses across the curriculum at the advanced level. Fifteen out of the sixteen surveyed universities also have active writing/communication centers.

Support for teaching writing and communication at the graduate level is uneven. The Jones School is perhaps unique in having a fully integrated communication program for its MBA students. In the past, the Cain Project in Engineering and Professional Communication offered innovative and effective communication support for students in science and engineering through a combination of thesis-writing seminars, communication-intensive courses, workshops, and individual coaching. When the funding for this program ended in 2008, the School of Engineering retained two of the Cain Project’s full-time senior lecturers and the School of Natural Sciences retained two of its part-time senior lecturers to continue the communication support, albeit in a reduced capacity. Much of the current communication instruction in science and engineering is currently directed toward undergraduates. Although the Office of International Students and Scholars (OISS) estimates that about 35 to 40 percent of graduate students are nonnative speakers of English, there is no regularly offered ESL course designed with their needs in mind.

It is not difficult to draw the conclusion—as did the three outside reviewers—that Rice lags behind its peers in its institutional commitment to writing. We would like to make clear, however, that our recommendations are not simply about playing catch-up to universities with
which we routinely compete for students. We took up the challenge of envisioning a program that would not only put us in the national conversation about communication pedagogy, but that capitalizes on Rice’s existing strengths and its academic and extracurricular culture. While all the reviewers reacted positively to the ambition articulated by faculty, students, and administrators that Rice become a national leader in communication pedagogy, one external reviewer went so far as to suggest turning the belatedness of our entry onto the national scene into a strength. As he put it, “Rice is in the virtually unique position of being able to create a 21st Century Writing Program . . . precisely because it doesn’t have an entrenched, legacy program.” Although the reviewer was speaking specifically about the creation of a technologically advanced program that would go beyond writing as it is traditionally understood to encompass emerging technologically based forms of communication (a topic we address in detail below), we think that his point can be understood more generally. We have the freedom to look at programs across the country and to assess their appropriateness for Rice. We also have the opportunity to create something distinctive that takes advantage of Rice’s characteristic strengths, particularly its robust student research culture, its college system, and its proactive approach to technology.

EXISTING RESOURCES

So far we have painted a somewhat grim picture of the state of writing and communication at Rice. We do not intend to discount the many and diverse resources already in place that could be organized into a single new initiative. What follows is a list of some exemplary resources and projects; we cannot list all of them but hope to indicate the range of current activities around communication.

Instructors

We have a staff of energetic and gifted teachers in the COMM program who also have substantial experience as cross-disciplinary consultants. Over the past few years, their COMM 103 courses have become increasingly topic-oriented and thus closer to the kind of First-Year Writing-intensive Seminars we have in mind. We also have talented graduate students with experience in writing pedagogy who would be eager to enhance their credentials and their stipends by serving as writing-center consultants or as teachers of First-Year Writing-intensive Seminars.

Courses and Academic Initiatives

The Cain project has left a legacy of classes that can serve as models for campus-wide initiatives for all types of communication. NSCI 121: Writing in the Natural Sciences, a course developed and taught by former Cain Project instructors, is an excellent model for teaching freshmen how to write data-driven scientific research articles. The Bioengineering Department has an outstanding track record for integrating written, oral, and visual communication in its core courses, in the major elective courses, and in independent research courses. Students have multiple opportunities to develop their skills, particularly their oral and visual communication skills, and to benefit from substantive feedback provided by faculty and their peers.
Environmental Biology offers advanced communication courses directed toward field-specific communication instruments such as scientific posters. The Jones School offers two sections of an undergraduate course in business communication for their business minor; the course includes writing workshops as well as presentation and interview coaching.

There are many courses in the undergraduate curriculum where, with the buy-in of departmental faculty, it would be relatively easy to incorporate a communication-intensive component. Many departments have capstone or advanced-research courses that would seem to lend themselves to this enhancement. Again, our cross-campus focus on undergraduate research through programs like RUSP, Century Scholars, and Humanities Research Center undergraduate fellows program would dovetail with the teaching of disciplinary professional-communication skills. This focus is a distinctive element of our research culture and would give our Center program, for example, a unique shape.

On the graduate level, the School of Engineering offers a thesis-writing seminar each semester for students working on a thesis or paper for publication. Engineering also supports CAAM 600, a team-taught communication-intensive graduate course for students preparing a CAAM MA/PhD thesis. This course was piloted in 2006, and it became a required course for all second-year CAAM students in 2008. Last year, Engineering added ENGI 510: Professional and Managerial Communication, a course for professional masters’ students. Former Cain Project faculty appointed in the School of Natural Sciences offer a summer short course in thesis writing for graduate students. In addition to formal courses, Engineering and Natural Sciences communication faculty offer workshops on topics such as data presentation, plagiarism, fellowship applications, and poster design; however, the number of workshops offered each year has gone down since the Cain Project ended.

The Jones School has a very well-developed program for their MBA students, including leadership-communication courses for all three academic tracks and peer-tutoring initiatives where second-year students assist first-year students with writing projects.

In the Humanities, the English Department, for example, requires a highly successful third-year writing workshop for its graduate students to transform seminar papers into publishable articles. It also includes elements of public presentation and active listening and has offered instruction in answering and asking questions at professional conferences.

Communication Support

The School of Engineering is also a leader in supporting communication outside the classroom. In 2010-11, former Cain Project professional-communication faculty supported oral and visual communication instruction in 18 engineering courses that enroll a total of 575 students.

Finally, one excellent and perhaps less well-known campus resource for communication in the curriculum is the Digital Media Center, which offers support for student and faculty work with film editing, web design, and digital media. The DMC offers workshops for COMM 103 as well as for courses across the disciplines, and it could certainly offer workshops in conjunction
with the new Center for Written, Oral, and Visual Communication that would emphasize the crucial technological component of twenty-first-century communication.

**APPROACH**

The Working Group is fully aware of the many groups of people who have a stake in communication at Rice. We are also aware that all of these groups live with different exigencies and timelines—from students who might like to see changes in place before they graduate, to the undergraduate dean who would like to see a first-year program in place for incoming first-year students next fall, to the administrators who necessarily think in terms of long-term costs and strategies. We want, then, to provide recommendations that are both ambitious and realistic: ambitious because we think Rice students and faculty deserve no less than a carefully considered and complete program, and realistic because the program we propose has many parts, all of which require labor and imagination for their successful implementation.

We have, therefore, made two decisions with regard to our approach. The first is to think of the communication program we propose as a four-year process for which we offer a timeline at the end of this report. We are convinced that, if the program is to get off the ground, there must be certain key elements in place by fall 2012: these include the creation of the Program for Writing and Communication and the consolidation of current COMM courses under its auspices; the appointment of a Faculty Advisory Board for the PWC; the appointment of an interim PWC Director; the putting in place of a first-year seminar requirement; and the establishment of the Center for Written, Oral, and Visual Communication with a provisional staff. Further down the line are the appointment of a permanent Director, the growth of the Center staff and of the Center itself and the establishment of a program of advanced writing or writing and communication in the disciplines. The ultimate organization of the program we propose is outlined in a flow chart in the final section of this report. We feel that this sequential approach will allow us to address the most glaring problems we and the outside reviewers have identified while ensuring that, even as we address these, we have access and commitment to a larger vision. Because the final academic stage of the program—writing and communication in the disciplines—is also the most difficult to realize and to administer, we also think faculty across the university would benefit from the kind of ongoing discussion that could be facilitated by the new PWC Director and perhaps take place through Center programming.

This brings us to the second aspect of our approach. While the Faculty Senate has charged us with envisioning a new program, there are many elements of the details and, indeed, the character of that program that are more properly the provenance of others, especially the eventual PWC Director. It is this person and the Faculty Advisory Board, in conversation with faculty, students, and administrators, who will ultimately shape communication at Rice. It is essential for purposes of recruiting a truly stellar director that we simultaneously demonstrate our commitment to the PWC and make it clear that it is up to him or her to give the program shape and momentum. Other elements of our proposed program must be fleshed out by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, the undergraduate and graduate deans, and the central administration. We are aware, of course, that many—although not all—elements of the program
will cost money; while we have tried to indicate the scale of particular components, we have not offered a detailed budget. We have been in conversation throughout the writing of this report with key administrators like the Dean of Undergraduates and the Provost to ensure there are no surprises when it comes to cost.

**Principles**

This report and its recommendations also come with—and indeed come out of—a set of principles articulated and agreed upon by the Working Group in the course of its deliberations and the shaping of its response to the nearly univocal recommendations of the outside consultants. Before entering into a discussion of the components of our proposals, we would like to state them here. The working group agrees on the following principles:

- Writing is not simply a skill or the expression of already existing ideas, but is intimately linked to the process of thinking and modes of knowing.
- Writing is a professional practice. Most members of the Rice faculty who are engaged in research write for a living, according to the conventions established by his or her academic discipline to reflect its subject matter, its standards of evidence, and its kind of truth.
- Different disciplines may emphasize different aspects of communication and different kinds of writing. All disciplines can learn from the communication protocols of other disciplines: humanists can, for example, learn from the sciences to present their work more visually, while scientists can learn to be more attentive to the role of language in constructing as well as in reflecting meaning.
- Writing in its traditional sense of print on paper or words on a screen is part of a larger world of professional communication that includes oral and visual modes. Communication has been profoundly altered in the twenty-first century by technological invention and distribution. The shift from page to screen to cloud has challenged us to provide new kinds of experiences for our students and to think about their relation to older forms of technology. We, therefore, speak of “writing and communication” to emphasize the importance of (different kinds of) writing to all the disciplines and to underline the importance of other, proliferating forms of communication.
- Communication instruction should meet students where they are and help them to get to the next level. Although some students require remedial writing instruction, learning to write is not a remedial process nor one that can be completed by reaching a particular level of competence. Everyone can learn to write better. This involves direct instruction, practice, and ongoing support: in other words, for Rice, this involves entering an academic culture of communication.
- Any research institution must also be responsible for the teaching of disciplinary forms of communication to its graduate students. Thus, a responsible Program in Writing and Communication must include instruction and support for graduate-level communication.
• As Rice’s graduate and undergraduate students become increasingly diverse with respect to national origin, we must respond institutionally to make sure that nonnative speakers of English get appropriate instruction and support.

• While academic communication is practiced across the university, and while faculty from across the university should be involved in communication instruction, some faculty members will have less experience than others in such instruction and will need support in their teaching of writing, oral, and/or visual communication.

• Even though we acknowledge that one can be an expert in the field of writing and communication, a successful communication program requires investment from all areas of the university. Such a program will not work if its faculty is seen as merely providing a service to other parts of the campus.

• The teaching of writing and communication is part of an academic field that, like other fields, involves expertise and research. Because, as we have stated earlier, writing is an ongoing process, there are no quick fixes for communication and communication pedagogy: one cannot learn to write or to teach writing without effort.

• Rice is uniquely positioned to respond to and to include in our vision new communication technologies and the emerging cultures they are creating. We can and must be flexible in looking not only to the persistent importance of traditional writing forms and to the dazzling array of present technologies but also to future changes in technologies of communication and their implications for writing, communication, and pedagogy.

• A communication program at Rice should draw from Rice’s traditional strengths and specific culture while taking advantage of what peer institutions have already learned and enshrined in their communication programs.

**THE PROGRAM FOR WRITING AND COMMUNICATION**

This section describes the three components of the program we propose and addresses the issue of the administrative structure of the program.

A. FIRST-YEAR WRITING-INTENSIVE SEMINAR (FWS)

   The initial, introductory course in a vertical four-year writing and communication program would be a First-Year Writing-intensive Seminar, which would optimally be taken at some point during the first year and required of all students. (ESL students who sign up for a FWS in the spring of their first year and are placed into COMM 100 at that point would have to take a FWS the following fall).

Assessment

   Instead of the highly complex composition exam taken by current students, we would substitute a simpler exam whose goal would be to identify those students—mostly ESL learners-
-whose command of written English is weak enough to require a remedial writing course. These students would be required to take the remedial course, modeled on the current COMM 100, and then take a First-Year Writing-intensive Seminar. While this assessment system is not a finely honed instrument, we feel it would be effective in identifying those students most in need of help. An important role of the Faculty Advisory Board will be to establish the format of this assessment.

**Guidelines for the Seminars**

In order to serve the diverse needs of our student body, and to avoid adding further requirements to already full schedules, we would give students a choice of First-Year Writing-intensive Seminars in as many different departments and disciplines as possible. Deans from each school would play an active role in soliciting seminars from their schools; we hope that the course designations (the four-letter registrar’s code) will indicate the school or division in which the course originates.

It is important that these courses count toward distribution so that students who elect to take one outside of the school in which they plan to major do not add another university-wide requirement. Our recommendation is that each FWS be designed to meet the criteria for distribution credit in the division in which the Department offering the seminar is based (criteria are listed at: [http://registrar.rice.edu/students/distribution_credit/](http://registrar.rice.edu/students/distribution_credit/)). Each department would have the freedom to decide whether the writing-intensive seminars that they offer would count toward their major. (For some examples of such courses, see appendix B.)

First-Year Writing-intensive Seminars would not necessarily replace the Freshman Seminars that are currently offered, but many current Freshman Seminars would presumably fit the guidelines or could be revised to do so. Of course, any other existing courses that either fit the guidelines or that could be revised to fit them could also become FWS. The guidelines for the First-Year Writing-intensive Seminars would be as follows:

1. There should be between five and seven writing assignments.
2. There should be between five thousand and six thousand words of writing over the course of the semester.
3. Students should be asked to revise at least half of the writing that they do.
4. There should be at least three hours of classroom time devoted specifically to discussion of writing.
5. Students should have ample opportunity to meet with the professor or a teaching assistant to discuss their writing assignments.
6. A substantial research or seminar paper is optional, but if there is one, it should be broken down into two or three assignments over the course of the semester.
7. Some of the assignments could be geared toward types of writing that are particular to the field in which the course is being offered.
8. Some of the assignments should involve supported oral presentations.
9. At least two-thirds of the course grade should be based on the writing assignments.
10. There should be a maximum of fifteen students in the course.
**Staffing**

We would need 66 seminars for an entering class of 1,000 students. These will be staffed by a combination of tenure-track faculty, those teaching already in COMM (six instructors teaching over 32 sections of COMM 103), additional NTT faculty, and advanced graduate students. The ratio of these three groups is difficult to predict, but starting with a realistic number of 16 tenure-track faculty teaching FWS in a given year, the remaining 50 courses would be taught by a combination of NTT faculty and graduate students.

**Non-tenure-track (NTT) Faculty**

The COMM faculty currently consists of an equal number of recent Rice PhDs and instructors with doctorates from other institutions, working on three-year contracts. The positions have served as bridge funding or as a postdoc program for Rice PhDs who gain valuable teaching experience in this way. Employing PhDs from other programs would add to the national exposure of our writing and communication program. If we continue to employ people outside the Houston area, we will need to include in the budget some money for hiring and recruiting.

Each COMM faculty member currently teaches three courses a semester (a 3/3 load). Assuming that each NTT faculty member will teach one upper-level course in communication (such as the current COMM courses in leadership or digital communication) each of these faculty would teach five courses a year in the FWS program.

The hiring of NTT faculty would be the provenance of the PWC Director (see below), but it is important that s/he consult with Deans of the academic schools about staffing needs. Some schools have fewer faculty resources than others to spend on these seminars, and it is important that all disciplines be represented in our offerings. For the first year of the program, depending on when the new PWC Director is hired, the hiring of additional NTT faculty could be done by a committee that includes the current director of COMM and members of the FAB.

**Graduate Students**

Advanced graduate students could also teach in the FWS program. Not only would this add instructors to the pool, but it would tap a body of energetic scholar-teachers for whom designing a course would be a valuable professional experience. Given the gap between our graduate stipends in Humanities and those at comparable schools (not to mention gaps in teaching opportunities), the teaching experience would be of great benefit to the graduate students. As their student evaluations show, carefully selected and trained graduate students make excellent teachers.

**Tenure-Track Faculty**

We are aware that some tenure-track faculty who would like to teach an FWS might not feel confident teaching writing and/or communication. To begin with, we should provide a summer workshop for tenure-track faculty who wish to teach an FWS. The Center for Written,
Oral, and Visual Communication would also offer communication pedagogy workshops throughout the year.

We are aware that tenure-track faculty members might need an incentive to develop a new course, either in the form of research funding or teaching assistance from writing center staff.

Costs to the University: salary, benefits, overhead, and recruitment and professional development support for contingent faculty; stipends for graduate-student teachers and assistants; research funds for faculty.

Other issues: Office space for NTT faculty and graduate students.

B. THE CENTER FOR WRITTEN, ORAL, AND VISUAL COMMUNICATION

As we explained in our description of the current situation, Rice’s Writing Center lags behind those of our peer institutions in crucial and dramatic ways. While centers at many other universities have a strong physical and web presence and offer, in addition to tutoring, programs and workshops for students at every stage in their academic careers, we struggle to provide tutorial support for courses other than COMM 103. (See Appendix C) Our proposal addresses three key components of what we envision as a vibrant Center for Written, Oral, and Visual Communication: location, staffing, and programming.

The Center for Written, Oral, and Visual Communication is an essential part of the PWC, and its setting and capacity are extremely important. The Center should ideally have offices for all of its faculty, seminar rooms for group meetings and workshops, and carrels for one-on-one consultations between students and staff. While one-on-one consultation will be the daily work of the Center, we also think of it as a place for innovative programming for all aspects of communication.

We are fortunate that there is some space on the second floor of Fondren Library that could be renovated and used for a Writing Center. (See appendix D) While not enormous, at a little over three thousand square feet, it is big enough to accommodate individual consultation carrels, a place for group work, and cubicle offices for staff. It also has the advantages of twenty-four-hour accessibility and of proximity to study spaces and to a large space that might in the near future house the Digital Media Center (DMC). If the Writing Center and the DMC were to occupy adjacent spaces, these repurposed areas of the library might form an Information Commons that would allow students at the Center for Written, Oral, and Visual Communication to take advantage of the visual resources which the DMC offers. Further down the line, as the library continues the reframing of its mission in response to the digital revolution, the Information Commons could become part of a Research and Learning Center, or the Center could occupy its own named building. Both of these possibilities offer naming opportunities for donors with an investment in communication at Rice.
**Personnel**

There are two models from which we draw our plan for staffing the Center. One is Rice’s Cain Project, which had in its time a comparable mission for a smaller population. The other is the composite of aspirant centers at peer institutions. If we “scale up” from the Cain Project’s six faculty members for two schools, and if we follow the staffing models of MIT and Stanford, for example, we conclude that we will need ten to twelve professional staff members when the Center is fully functioning. As the survey of centers in Appendix C reveals, the number of staff and their qualifications vary from place to place; MIT and Stanford have some of the most innovative centers and rely on professional staff—part- and full-time lecturers with advanced degrees—to do some of the tutoring and to do all of the support work for communication in the disciplines.

It is not our place, of course, to spell out in detail the roles of the Center staff. This will be the job of the PWC Director. We do want to indicate, however, the scope of the work to be done in the Center, as distinct from the teaching of FWS, and to note how some of the universities with whom we spoke about their centers made the choices they did. Center staff will be responsible for tutoring, programming for graduate and undergraduate students (other centers compositely offer workshops on plagiarism; dissertation boot camps; short courses on professional writing, etc.), as well as for ESL support, web design and maintenance, and program assessment. While we believe a lot of the one-on-one tutoring can and should be done by undergraduates—we hope to strengthen the link to the College Fellows program—we feel strongly that some of the work should be done by graduate students and by professionals with advanced degrees. MIT has chosen not to employ student tutors, but to underscore its commitment to communication by hiring professionals at a professional wage. While we would not recommend this approach, we believe that the Center must hire a professional director and assistant directors with expertise in writing support for all the different disciplines, certainly by the time we begin the upper-level “communication in the discipline” initiative. (See time line.) Some of these professionals could also teach FWS or advanced writing courses; at MIT and Stanford lecturers often split their time between teaching and consulting.

Because of the proposed commitment in this proposal to hiring new instructors to teach FWS, we realize that there may not currently be resources to hire the personnel necessary for a top-tier Center. Thus, we imagine that the staffing of the Center will take place over the next three or four years. A minimum first step would be the hiring of a Center Director, who could be someone already in place in the COMM program, and one staff member. We also propose fashioning joint appointments wherever possible and appropriate between the Center and existing faculty and staff in communication across the university. For example, some of the former Cain Project faculty might be interested in being part of the Center. We do not know what cost-sharing arrangements would be appropriate here, but we feel strongly that such people should have some kind of connection to the Center, even if they are housed elsewhere.

**Programming**
We have an opportunity to make Rice’s Center unique through innovative programming that is responsive to the needs of our community. Programming should address the specific needs of all its potential clients: graduate and undergraduate students, ESL students, faculty and even staff. (The Jones School now teaches short courses in business communication for staff). While some programming could take place at the Center or in the library, this is a chance to reach out to the colleges and departments and to respond to students where they live and work. We can imagine workshops in cutting edge presentation technology such as Prezi, and in older forms of written rhetoric. The Center could have a brown bag lunch on senior theses, or a roundtable on academic interviewing. It could sponsor contests in new media productions, or in personal essays.

*Graduate Students and the Center*

While we have dealt with graduate students primarily in their roles as instructors and consultants, they would also be important consumers of the Center’s programming. The most immediate need is for one or more graduate ESL courses, but we hope that the Center will offer a rich variety of programming for graduate students in all aspects of communication. Current feedback from the Graduate Student Association (GSA) suggests that graduate students are particularly interested in learning presentation skills, especially those involving multiple media. Workshops focused on presentation might also include topics such as how to answer questions, voice and projection, active listening, and so forth. We also envision discipline-specific seminars on publishing, dissertation writing, and the job market. (The last might produce links with Career Services, which tends not to focus on academic jobs.) We would like to emphasize that graduate students are looking not for peer editing but for instruction from published postdocs and faculty.

Costs to the university: renovation of Fondren 2nd floor balcony; salaries, benefits, and overhead for Center Director and staff members; hourly wages for graduate student and undergrad peer tutors (much of this is in place); one-time cost of web design if web designer not yet on staff.

C. COMMUNICATION IN THE DISCIPLINE

In addition to the first-year writing courses, the PWC will eventually include a “communication in the discipline” component. This element will address the need for students to write and speak effectively according to the specialized conventions of their chosen field of study. Appropriate learning experiences for both undergraduates and graduates will be provided. The development of specific curricular elements of “communication in the disciplines” will be overseen by the Faculty Advisory Board in conversation with the PWC Director, departments, and schools in the next few years.

For undergraduates, many majors at Rice already include courses with significant writing/oral presentation components, and such courses are likely to provide the basis for the “communication in the discipline” requirement. In departments where such courses are not in place, it should be possible to offer one or more I courses where the subject matter is taught
through individual student research, writing, and oral presentation as opposed to the standard “lecture and test” paradigm. Two examples from the Biochemistry and Cell Biology (BCB) and Bioengineering (BioE) Departments may be pertinent. BCB used to teach Developmental Biology as a 300-level lecture course, following chapters in a textbook. Developmental Biology is now taught as a 400-level course using analysis of relevant scientific literature and student presentations, both written and oral. In BioE, several courses include design projects that require students to work together to develop a solution to a particular problem and then generate a written report and oral presentation on the final design. Such courses provide training not just in formal presentations but also in effective teamwork.

For graduate students, communication training will vary from discipline to discipline. Within the sciences, the need to write effective progress reports, qualifying exams, and core professional documents such as scientific papers, reviews, and grant proposals is particularly pressing. Again, several departments on campus already have courses in place that address some of these graduate-student needs and other departments can build on these examples. In providing advanced training in communication, these courses will contribute actively to one of the underlying goals of the Rice educational experience: development of the kind of leadership skills that are essential to professional success.

The overarching goal of this requirement is to provide all Rice undergraduate and graduate students with significant, pertinent communication training in their academic disciplines. That training will vary from discipline to discipline in terms of both content and delivery. The communication requirement could be fulfilled by a single course, or by a series of courses with communication-intensive components. They could be offered at either the school or department level, or both. These courses could emphasize, as appropriate, different kinds of communication, although they should all include instruction in both writing and presentation and should focus on communication as well as on content. We propose that the PWC Program Director meet with faculty within all schools and departments in order to learn the kinds of communication skills that faculty members judge appropriate for their students. From these discussions, specific guidelines for each major/graduate program at Rice would be developed, which, despite their program-specific features, would offer all students the same degree of training.

We have suggested the target implementation date of 2015 for this requirement in part because we anticipate that departments and schools will want to have time to discuss the kinds of opportunities they wish to offer. We also anticipate that the Center, once established, could offer support for those discussions. This requirement can only be fully put in place if there are resources in the Center to support the ongoing work of communication in the disciplines; therefore we have chosen a target implementation date of 2015, which coincides with the date for expanded staffing of the Center. Of course, some departments and schools already have elements of this program in place, and others might be ready with at least some elements of their communication in the disciplines offerings long before 2015.
Cost to the university (deferred): additional staff for Center.

**ADMINISTRATION AND REPORTING**

The Program in Writing and Communication proposed here would involve multiple phases that would be implemented over a period of several years. In order to ensure that the entire program moves forward in a timely, coordinated manner, active oversight of the developing project would be essential. Once the program is established, circumstances will no doubt provide opportunities for further enrichment and modification. Thus, beyond the initial execution of the plan, effective, ongoing administration would be continuously required to maintain the first-rate program we envisage.

The administrative elements we propose below are aimed at fulfilling these organizational goals. We propose a route for the initial implementation of the program and for subsequent focused administration as the Program for Writing and Communication becomes a signature component of the Rice educational experience in the coming years.

A. FACULTY ADVISORY BOARD (FAB)

*FAB Membership and Terms of Service*

The mandate of the FAB is to ensure continuity of vision and curricular quality as the program becomes established and going forward. The FAB has three main functions. It acts in an oversight capacity to establish curricular guidelines and assessments, in an advisory capacity to the PWC Director on all areas of the program, and as a liaison between the Director and the academic schools, as well as between the Director and the Faculty Senate. The main consideration in its constitution is that board members should represent all major academic divisions at Rice to ensure integration of the PWC into all schools and departments. We propose that the FAB and its chair be appointed by the Senate in consultation with the Provost and that it should consist of 1) a faculty member from each of the four major academic schools at Rice (Engineering, Humanities, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences); 2) one member from either the School of Architecture or the Music School; 3) a Chair who could be a faculty member from any school, and 4) an at-large member. The Dean of Undergraduates (or designee) and the Dean of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies (or designee) would be advisory (non-voting), ex-officio members of the FAB. Members would serve staggered three-year terms. In the interest of continuity, it seems reasonable that some members of the faculty subcommittee preparing this report should be among the founding members of the FAB. The FAB will have a key role in the initial year of the program, overseeing the working out of details of various elements of the plan.
Roles of the FAB

1. Appointment of the PWC Director
   The FAB would act as the core of the search committee for the position of PWC Interim Director this year, and for the permanent Director the year following. (See time line). Although there are many kinds of qualifications for the Director position, we should remain somewhat flexible in our approach to the search, especially as we would be learning from the candidates about the field of communication pedagogy. All candidates should have a PhD in an academic field, administrative experience, and experience with teaching written, oral, and visual communication. The Director should be given a title and resources appropriate to the complex and intellectually demanding work the position requires.

2. Long-Term Roles of the FAB
   The FAB will have an ongoing advisory role in all aspects of the program. While final programmatic decisions will rest with the PWC Director, the FAB will meet with the Director at least twice a year, and additionally as necessary, to provide support and consultation about the program. These meetings would be aimed at identifying program elements that are working well and areas that need improvement. A major meeting should be organized at the end of each academic year, at which time the FAB and the PWC Director would work together to arrive at an agenda of programmatic changes needed for the following academic year. This agenda would be presented to the Provost at an annual meeting. We propose that in addition to the FAB and the PWC Director, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs also attend this meeting.

   The Director will consult with the FAB with regard to all three components of the program: the FWS, the Center, and, as discussions unfold, Communication in the Disciplines. Some areas in which the Director and the FAB will collaborate will include:

   · identification and recruitment of current faculty as teachers of FWS
   · ensuring appropriate distribution coverage of FWS across the university
   · hiring of NTT faculty to staff remaining FWS courses and the Center
   · identification of budgeting and staffing needs
   · assessment of all aspects of the program
while the Director and the FAB will have some oversight over whether proposed courses meet the FWS guidelines, the idea, at least in the first years of the program, is to be as inclusive as possible.

Roles of the PWC Director
The Director of the PWC will be responsible for identifying and, where appropriate, coordinating communication initiatives at Rice. Other tasks include

1. setting goals for student learning in conjunction with the FAB and other stakeholders and putting a process for assessing these goals in place;
2. establishing the physical Center and hiring the Center Director;
3. deciding on staff requirements and reporting structures and hiring staff to teach FWS and to work in the Center;
4. organizing and implementing the first-year writing requirement; and
5. working with departments to develop guidelines for communication in the discipline, and providing organizational support for disciplinary initiatives.

B. ADMINISTRATIVE ORGANIZATION FOR THE PWC
We propose that the reporting hierarchy for the PWC should be as follows. All staff within the first-year writing program will report to the PWC Director. Staff within the writing center will report to the Director of the Center for Written, Oral, and Visual Communication, who will, in turn, report to the PWC Director. The PWC Director and the FAB will both report to the Provost, through the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.

An organizational chart to illustrate these administrative arrangements is presented below.
IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation timeline begins with the presentation of this report to the Faculty Senate and ends with the establishment of a more ambitiously built environment for the Center for Written, Oral, and Visual Communication. At the same time, we imagine the Center growing in terms of staff and scope along with the program for communication in the disciplines that it supports. With this scenario, we should take significant steps by Fall 2012—in time for the arrival of the class of 2016. We hope that spelling out a series of steps toward the final goal of a named and established Center will help keep the vision in place while allowing for more than incremental improvement in the culture of communication at Rice.
TIME LINE

November 2011: WG report presented to senate

November-December 2011: Faculty Advisory Board appointed; Interim PWC Director appointed; Plans for Fondren renovations submitted

February 2012: FWS Requirement/Distribution rules written by CUC; tenure-track FWS teachers recruited by deans and FAB

March 2012: Contingent Faculty hired by current COMM director, others, in consultation with schools

Summer 2012: Fondren renovations completed; Workshops held for tenure track, contingent faculty, and graduate students on communication pedagogy. Program website created.

July 2012: Joint appointments with PWC for existing communications staff in engineering and sciences created; PWC Director in place; Center Director appointed by PWC Director

Fall 2012: FWS in place; Center workshops begin; Graduate ESL course begins; search for permanent PWC Director begins

Spring 2013: Permanent Director selected; appointment by July 1. Now or Fall 2013 Director consults with divisions/departments about disciplinary communications' fundraising for larger Center space begins

Fall 2015: Center Phase II staffing in place; Named Center in place; Communication in the disciplines formally established
## APPENDIX A: PEER INSTITUTIONS WRITING PROGRAM CHART FROM 2010
### WORKING GROUP REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Freshman writing course req</th>
<th>Upper Level requirement</th>
<th>Writing Center*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes - g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Tech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes - fac, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes - g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes - u, g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes - u, g, pd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes - u, g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes - pd, prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - u, fac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes - u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. Chicago</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - u, g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes - u, g, fac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes - u, g, prof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICE</td>
<td>1 (comp exam exempt)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No space-- u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* staffing: u=undergraduates; g=graduate students; pd=postdocs; fac=faculty; prof=professional writers/editors
APPENDIX B: LIST OF POSSIBLE FIRST YEAR WRITING-INTENSIVE SEMINARS (FWS) PROPOSED BY RICE FACULTY

ENGINEERING

Why buildings stand up
Design of Simple things
Seven Wonders of the Ancient World
Building bridges
Ships: old and modern
Evolution of cars
Building Houston

HUMANITIES

Marriage: Past, Present, and Future
Everyday Feminisms
The Public and the Private
War Stories
Cities in Novels
Europe in American Literature
Early Christian Writings
Violence in pre-modern Europe
Medieval Encounters
Food for Thought: Writing about the Culture and Politics of Food
Communicating a Sense of Place and Identity
Gender and Sexuality in American Popular Culture

Material Cultures

MUSIC
Musical Lives
Great Literature in Great Music

NATURAL SCIENCE
Sex and its role in evolution
The black death to AIDS – the great epidemics of history
The chemical basis of mood and personality
The recombinant DNA revolution
Technological disasters
Biotechnology in the movies
Alternative energy
Human genome project
Women in science and engineering
Various courses on the history of sci/eng, like L DaVinci, Kepler, etc
Green chemistry
Global Health
Nanotechnology
Stem cells
Sustainable energy
Tissue engineering

Genetic engineering

History of Space Exploration

SOCIAL SCIENCE

Conflict Resolution

Indiana Jones versus real archaeology.

The economics of health care.

Why are countries with a lot of oil susceptible to civil war?

Are criminals "wired" differently than the rest of us?

Can you believe in science and religion?

ARCHITECTURE

Thinking Visually

Reading Buildings

Urban Writing
## APPENDIX C: PEER INSTITUTIONS WRITING CENTER STAFF AND DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School &amp; Undergraduate Enrollment</th>
<th>Writing Center Staff</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown 6K</td>
<td>J. Walter Wilson Program Coordinator (in charge of Writing Center and Writing Fellows) fellows Coordinator of ESL Writing Support undergraduate receptionists (shifts) 60 Associates (grad students)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.brown.edu/Student_Services/Writing_Center/">http://www.brown.edu/Student_Services/Writing_Center/</a> Writing Center ESL workshop series List of resources for writers and teachers on web site Physical site; appointments and drop-in hours While Brown does not have a specific writing course students are required to take; they work on a portfolio system and must demonstrate competence in writing AND a commitment to improving wiring. This can mean they take writing intensive courses, post blogs, work for literary magazine, etc. Director tracks progress of students that the registrar identifies as not having completed requirement. Center Director also works with faculty writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal Tech .9K</td>
<td>3 instructors 3 peer tutors</td>
<td>CLOSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia 7.8K</td>
<td>Center Director</td>
<td><a href="http://uwp.columbia.edu/writing-center/">http://uwp.columbia.edu/writing-center/</a> Writing Center program and center staff overlap; graduate students and some adjunct faculty paid hourly for one-on-one consultations Are working toward wiring support for classes in curriculum Physical site; appointments and drop-in hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell 13.8K</td>
<td>4 Directors: Program, First Year Writing Seminars,</td>
<td><a href="http://www.arts.cornell.edu/knight_institute/walkin/walkin.htm">http://www.arts.cornell.edu/knight_institute/walkin/walkin.htm</a> The Knight Institute for Writing in the Disciplines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Writing Workshop, Writing in the Majors | 5 locations  
| 1 Co-Director, Writing in the Majors | Appointments and drop-in hours, 3 in libraries  
| 3 Writing Workshop Instructors | Offer TA workshops and Faculty Seminar in Writing (one each semester) Instruction, taught by graduate student and faculty co-facilitators (“generous stipend of $1000”). Meets once a week for six weeks, either summer or fall for following semester. Train teachers of first Year Writing Seminars  
| 3 Admin Staff Tutors | Web resources on avoiding plagiarism, archive of teaching materials  
|  | Offer prizes  
| Dartmouth 4.1K | Director of Student Writing Support (senior lecturer)  
| | Reference Bibliographer  
| | Media Learning technologist  
| | ESL Specialist  
| | 6 undergraduate staff including Head Tutor  
| | http://www.dartmouth.edu/~rwit/about.html  
| | Student Center for Research, Writing, and Information Technology (RWIT). Collaborates with Institute for Writing and Rhetoric (the writing and communication program with classes), the library, academic computing.  
| | 39 tutor (34 undergrads, 5 from Comp. Lit Masters Program)  
| | Dinner Hour Workshops  
| | Web page for media technology  
| | Physical location in library; 5 afternoon/evening hours per day, Sunday-Thurs  
| | “intensive fall training program” for tutors  
<p>| Duke 6.4K | Director?????? | <a href="http://twp.duke.edu/writing-studio">http://twp.duke.edu/writing-studio</a> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Tutors</th>
<th>Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Writing Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>Resource page including writing tips from Emory professors, Dissertation Resources, grammar and Style resources, “Higher order concerns”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Peer tutors</td>
<td>Open 6 days a week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 graduate tutors</td>
<td>2 locations, including library satellite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard 6.7K</td>
<td>Graduate Writing Tutor 9 for grad student clients)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 “Developmental Wring Fellows” (only 1 in science), who are grad students working with disciplinary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open 9-5 and Sun-Thurs evenings for drop-ins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basement location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **MIT 4.2K** | **9 Lecturers.**
Plus about 30 more in Writing Across the Curriculum |
- Speaking tutors seem to be separate
- [Writing and Communication Center](http://writing.mit.edu/wcc)
- MIT separates two possible functions of a Center: one-on-one tutoring and support for disciplinary writing.
- All tutors and consultants are professionals with advanced degrees; no student tutors
- All lecturers cover range of issues including, ESL, dissertations, oral communication
- One large open room with tables
- Open 5 day a week, including evening hours

| **Northwestern 8.3K** | **Director** (specialist in business comm.)
Undergrads (junior and seniors) used as wring consultants | [The Writing Place](http://www.writing.northwestern.edu/)
- 2 undergrad locations at the 2 campuses, also “Graduate Writing Place”
- ‘Dissertation Boot Camp”
- Open 7 days a week

| **Princeton 5K** | **Associate Director for the Writing Center, Program Assistant**
6 writing center head fellows
4 writing center outreach fellows | [Writing Center](http://www.princeton.edu/writing/center/)
- Appointments and evening drop-in hours
- Program (not Center) offers short courses that meet once a week for half a semester, 3 hours at a time (“Writing in Science and Engineering,” “Writing an Effective Scientific Research Article”
- Boot camps for dissertations, senior theses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Writing Center Fellows (undergrads)</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th>Directors, Coordinator, Tutors, Consultants</th>
<th>Web Page/Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stanford 6.7K</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2 Associate Directors, 1 administrative coordinator, 29 lecturers who split time b/t Center and Program, 29 Writing Consultants</td>
<td><a href="http://www.stanford.edu/dept/undergrad/cgi-bin/drupal_pwr/hwc">http://www.stanford.edu/dept/undergrad/cgi-bin/drupal_pwr/hwc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago 5.1K</td>
<td>Writing Tutors and Interns (15 tutors listed in Writing Tutor Schedule; for students in core courses)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Writing Studio</td>
<td><a href="http://writing-program.uchicago.edu/resources/tutor.htm">http://writing-program.uchicago.edu/resources/tutor.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanderbilt 6.8K</td>
<td>Director2, Assistant Directors, Office Administrator, 3 Clerks, 29 Writing Consultants</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Writing Studio</td>
<td><a href="http://www.vanderbilt.edu/writing/">http://www.vanderbilt.edu/writing/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Hume Writing Center at Stanford
  - Web page lists kinds of help for undergrads year by year
  - Included digital media, “High Tech tools”
  - Also lists info and events for grads (Dissertation Boot Camp, Writing Workshops, presentations, ESL)
  - 29 lectures typically teach 1-2 courses per quarter and devote 4-6 hours per week to the Center; this varies with demand
  - Center time can be tutoring or leading workshops, consulting

- Basically a tutoring program with a physical location

- Workshops on research papers
- Long-term consultant relations with graduate student clients
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>including MFAs, law students</th>
<th>Main location, plus satellite Elaborate Resources page, web site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yale 5.2K</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Journalism Faculty</td>
<td><a href="http://writing.yalecollege.yale.edu/about-writing-center">http://writing.yalecollege.yale.edu/about-writing-center</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Fellows (Visiting Writers)</td>
<td>Yale College Writing Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass Writing Tutor in each college.</td>
<td>Overseen by a Faculty Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also writing partner program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>