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Executive Summary

External Review: University of Kentucky Writing Program

During our December 9-11 visit to the University of Kentucky, we found many strengths that fostered the teaching of writing: strong leadership in the Writing Program; a core of informed teachers dedicated to teaching writing; a helpful TA orientation program; ongoing assessment efforts; and supportive, renowned creative writing faculty. To build on these strengths, we offer the following recommendations:

1. Convert the Writing Program to an independent unit—preferably a department—that reports to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The new unit might be called the Department of Writing Studies.

2. In addition to faculty in rhetoric and composition, also consult creative writing faculty about moving to the new unit.

3. Delineate the expertise and areas that the current faculty can address, and commit to hiring tenure-line faculty so that there are dedicated teaching and research lines in the following areas:
   a. New Media/Digital Writing
   b. Writing Assessment
   c. Technical/Business/Professional Writing
   d. First-Year Composition
   e. Writing Across the Curriculum/Writing in the Disciplines

4. Revise promotion/tenure criteria to fit the typical expectations for faculty in rhetoric and composition at RU/VH (Research University, Very High Research Activity) institutions.

5. Staff the unit with 12-15 Full-Time Lecturers with strong credentials in rhetoric and composition, and establish clear expectations for their performance reviews.

6. Provide career-progression opportunities for Full-Time Lecturers (e.g., Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer).

7. Convert the most qualified Part-Time Instructors to Full-Time Instructors.

8. Continue hiring qualified Teaching Associates, but consider a pool of applicants from across the university. Provide strong professional development for TAs.

9. Develop additional professional-development opportunities for all instructional personnel (TT, FTL, FTI, PTI, TA)
10. Develop an undergraduate degree (major, minor, certificate) in Writing Studies that is consistent with the mission of the new unit and with the university’s new core curriculum and strategic plan that links it closely with the community.

11. Foster greater collaboration among the Writing Studies program/department, the Writing Center, and the Writing Initiative to avoid mission confusion and to develop intellectual synergies that serve the University of Kentucky.

12. Build on current assessment practices to foster ongoing improvements in writing instruction.
Report

External Review: University of Kentucky Writing Program

Introduction

On December 9-11, 2007, two members of the Writing Program Administrators’ (WPA) Consultant-Evaluator Service (Joan Mullin and Duane Roen) visited the University of Kentucky to review the Writing Program. College of Arts and Sciences Dean Steven Hoch arranged for the visit, and Professor Deborah Holdstein, coordinator of the WPA Consultant-Evaluator Service, identified the evaluators as having broad preparation and experience in composition studies, writing across the curriculum, writing centers, and university and writing program administration.

Before the visit we reviewed the insightful self-study prepared by Randall Roorda, Director of the Writing Program. During our visit we met with several dozen individuals, including university, college, department, and program administrators; tenure-line faculty, lecturers, instructors, teaching assistants, Writing Center tutors, and undergraduate students.

In the pages that follow we offer observations and provide a rationale for our recommendations, keeping in mind current trends in writing research and practice, the goals articulated to us by administration interviewed, and the institutional context and constraints. These are offered as a way to begin conversations that will chart the future of writing instruction expected at RU/VH (Research University, Very High Research Activity) institutions, with which the University of Kentucky compares.

Commendations

Finding much to praise during our visit, we begin with some well-deserved commendations.

Self-Study Report

We were very impressed with the self-study report, crafted by Randall Roorda, Director of the Writing Program. We found the report compiled to be a concise and accurate evaluation of the conditions and questions that sponsored the Writing Program Consultant-Evaluator visit. In the interest of brevity, we will not repeat it here except to state that we agree with the self-assessment.
Writing Program Leadership

Randall Roorda (Director) and Deborah Kirkman (Assistant Director) are exemplary leaders in the Writing Program. Both are knowledgeable, diligent, resourceful, and articulate. This is not only our opinion, though, because among the people we met, Randall Roorda and Deborah Kirkman are very well respected and recognized for all that they do for the Writing Program and the University of Kentucky.

Instructional Personnel

We met with tenure-line faculty, Full-Time Lecturers, Full-Time Instructors, Part-Time Instructors, and Teaching Assistants during our visit. To a person, the ones we met are dedicated to teaching and to student learning. They strive to keep current in the field, despite their heavy workloads and modest compensation.

Professional Development

The orientation for Teaching Assistants is helpful within the limited time available. Additional graduate program mentors do their best to make certain that all instructional personnel understand the learning outcomes and objectives, as well as effective pedagogical strategies, and provide support throughout the semester as time allows. Especially commendable are the newly constituted reading groups that discuss influential books in the field, and whose collaborations have already begun to positively influence the Writing Program.

Assessment Efforts

The Writing Program is committed to continuous program assessment that is used to shape the curriculum and to respond to changing student populations. We were especially impressed that Deborah Kirkman is leading a collaborative team to publicize the program’s assessment efforts by invitation of the National Council of Teachers of English, which is leading an initiative on innovative approaches to assessment. It is not usual that a non-tenure-line faculty gains this kind of national attention for a writing program.

Creative Writing and Commitment to the Public

During our visit, we were reminded of the rich history of creative writing at the University of Kentucky. Some of the creative writing faculty are among the most respected public intellectuals in the United States. Their talent has brought attention to the region and is consistent with the goals of the Writing Program and with the institution’s strategic plans for more explicitly connecting the university and the community.
The Charge from the College of Arts and Sciences

Early in our visit, we met with Steven Hoch, Dean of Arts and Sciences; Leonidas Bachas Associate Dean for Research and Academic Programs; and Phil Harling, Associate Dean of Faculty to receive our charge. We were asked to consider the following questions in our review:

1. Is there coherence to the Writing Program?
2. What kinds of instructional personnel could maximize the quality of teaching in the Writing Program?
3. What teacher preparation and support would be optimal in Writing Program?
4. What is the ideal administrative structure for the Writing Program?

Recommendations and Rationale

1. Convert the Writing Program to an independent unit—preferably a department—that reports to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences. The new unit might be called the Department of Writing Studies.

Although we applaud the efforts of Writing Program faculty to persist in providing effective training to teaching staff and the delivery of informed, quality instruction to students, the conditions under which the Writing Program currently operates prevents it from providing writing instruction as effectively as expected in an RU/VH (Research University, Very High Research Activity) institution such as the University of Kentucky. These conditions result from being embedded in the Department of English, which has been struggling with its own challenges: finding its place in an institution undergoing general education reform, retention of faculty, declining majors, and control of courses designated as writing intensive. Those interviewed inside and outside the writing program indicate that

- the morale is low among the contingent faculty, largely charged with the teaching of writing in the department;
- English department support for understanding writing as a discipline, and including it in long-range departmental planning is insufficient;
- the research and teaching of writing is generally not valued in the department;
- adequate professional resources have not been allocated to the writing program;
- the Writing Program’s dedicated resources have been tapped for other English department priorities.

Although a lack of voice in departmental governance is not an issue, lack of being heard is.

The Writing Program faculty members have strong, traditional ties to the idea of working within the Department of English; however, the admitted reality is that the English
The department has continually demonstrated, most recently in its strategic plan, that given the challenges of English studies itself, the Writing Program is not and will not be a priority.

We recommend that the Writing Program become a free-standing department that combines and collaborates with writing initiatives across campus to form within the College of Arts and Sciences a strong, research unit with a major that builds on UK’s writing identity within the academic and larger community. This will allow the Department of English to focus its resources and energies on literature, and it will enable the new independent unit to support the delivery and assessment of writing in the first year, and foster the institution’s University Studies Program with the kind of expertise writing researchers can provide. This new department might be called the Department of Writing Studies to indicate that it has a broad scope. (Even though we refer to the unit as the Department of Writing Studies throughout this report, University of Kentucky faculty and administrators may wish to consider other possible names.)

After reviewing the Web site for the Department of Communication, we see no evidence that forming a Department of Writing Studies would impinge on the Department of Communication. That is, the Department of Communication announces that it focuses on “interpersonal, small group, mass, and organizational communication, with special attention given to health communication in each of these areas. Of course, communication theory and research are emphasized at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.”

2. In addition to faculty in rhetoric and composition, also consult creative writing faculty about moving to the new unit.

Before our visit to the campus, we were familiar with the work of some of the renowned creative writing faculty at the University of Kentucky. During our visit to the university, we learned more about the rich tradition of creative writers’ serving as models of public intellectuals—certainly a great source of pride for the institution and the state. However, we also learned that creative writers could benefit from greater support than the Department of English has been able to provide. With appropriate administrative, intellectual, and material support, the creative writing faculty could thrive.

We recommend that the College of Arts and Sciences facilitate conversations with the creative writers to determine whether they wish to join the writing faculty in forming a new independent Department of Writing Studies.

3. Delineate the expertise and areas that the current faculty can address, and commit to hiring tenure-line faculty so that there are dedicated teaching and research lines in the following areas:

   a. New Media/Digital Writing
   b. Writing Assessment
   c. Technical/Business/Professional Writing
   d. First-Year Composition
   e. Writing Across the Curriculum/Writing in the Disciplines
The new independent unit can relatively quickly increase its national visibility by hiring additional tenure-line faculty; however, in a new unit it is important that current faculty expertise be supported. Roorda might well continue as FYC director, but he might also serve as chair of the new unit; Kirkman has all the institutional history, currency, and experience for either an FYC director, or, given the conditions of her contract, at the minimum, head of assessment or co-director of FYC; Janet Eldred’s expertise might well continue to provide intellectual and administrative leadership in WAC. However, as a free-standing unit with potential undergraduate majors/minors, with the need to foster current research in writing studies, and with obligations to train staff and TAs, full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty are crucial. A strategic plan that builds on the expertise of the three existing instructors and establishes a research and writing identity consistent with both professional writing program guidelines and the institutional context must be designed collaboratively with the college office and the current, primary Writing Program staff. The above positions seem to be the most generative starting points.

4. Revise promotion/tenure criteria to fit the typical expectations for faculty in rhetoric and composition at RU/VH (Research University, Very High Research Activity) institutions.

The criteria for promotion and tenure for current and future Writing Program faculty and staff need to be clear, and they need to fit the work that faculty do in writing programs. The criteria commonly used in English departments often are not appropriate for faculty in rhetoric and composition, particularly those who direct writing programs. Available criteria, such as the following, should be used to formulate unit policies:

- Scholarship in Composition: Guidelines for Faculty, Deans, and Department Chairs
  http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/123785.htm

- P&T Guidelines for Work with Technology
  http://www.ncte.org/cccc/resources/positions/123793.htm

- "The Portland Resolution:" Guidelines for Writing Program Administrator Positions
  http://wpacouncil.org/positions/portlandres.html

5. Staff the unit with 12-15 Full-Time Lecturers with strong credentials in rhetoric and composition, and establish clear expectations for their performance reviews.

Fixed-term faculty have been publicly reminded in multiple ways by Department of English that they have little voice and little place within the community. For example, although it would cost little or nothing, they have not received support for attending the graduate TA pedagogy course.
In addition, over the years the contingent faculty, originally hired to teach writing courses, have been siphoned off the Writing Program and enlisted to teach all manner of English department courses at the 200, 300, 400, and even 500, and 600 levels. They fulfill the teaching role of full-time faculty at double the course load (4/4) and two-thirds (at most) of the cost. There are very few opportunities for promotion, recognition, merit, travel, or professional development except that provided through the funds available to the Writing Program.

Although the FTLs, FTIs and PTIs can and do contribute much to the Writing Program, their full schedules and low morale prevent them from fully participating as decision makers and curriculum builders. Their inclusion on Writing Program committees is remedying this, but such meetings do not mitigate the lack of time available for professional development. Nonetheless, because of their commitment, they take on other tasks despite little recognition and little opportunity for advancement; this is far more consistent with stressed conditions that one might find in a community college or a less research-focused institution.

The Department of Writing Studies could further strengthen its teaching effectiveness by hiring additional Full-Time Lecturers with doctoral degrees in rhetoric and composition. The full cadre probably needs to be in range of 12-15 FTLs. However, to maintain a commitment to research that will inform the unit’s activities and to assist with administrative and service functions of Writing Studies, at least some of the FTLs should have reduced teaching loads (3/3). To attract and retain these well qualified teachers, the salaries must be competitive (starting salaries in the $41,000-$43,000 range), and the FTLs need to be eligible for annual cost-of-living and merit raises. Given the dedicated service of the current FTLs, we encourage the department to retain as many of them as possible, gradually replacing those who retire or leave for other jobs, or those who prefer to teach for the Department of English. Those who remain with the Writing Program should have adequate opportunities to engage in professional development.

6. Provide career-progression opportunities for Full-Time Lecturers (e.g., Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Principal Lecturer).

To recruit and retain the very best Full-Time Lecturers, there should be a career progression for FTLs. For example, the ranks could be Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, and Principal Lecturer—or some other progression that fits within the personnel policies and procedures of the University of Kentucky and the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education.

7. Convert the most qualified Part-Time Instructors to Full-Time Instructors.

Although we acknowledge the need for some PTIs in a writing program, we recommend that the Department of Writing Studies use them sparingly. If there are well qualified individuals who wish to teach part-time, PTI positions can serve needs of those people and the program. As anyone reading this report knows, though, full-time teachers are more available on campus to meet the needs of students, which can be a factor in student
8. Continue hiring qualified Teaching Associates, but consider a pool of applicants from across the university. Provide strong professional development for TAs.

The newly formed Department of Writing Studies should have the freedom to hire the best qualified graduate students from a range of units across the university. In other free-standing writing programs, most of the teaching assistants come from English—as we expect will be the case at the University of Kentucky. However, graduate students in other fields can have strong interest and even valuable experience in teaching writing. We wish to emphasize that English graduate students need to have fair access to teaching assistantships in the Department of Writing Studies because such theoretical preparation and experience will complement their studies in literature and enhance their marketability when they apply for faculty positions. However, graduate students in English who are not interested in or have an antipathy for teaching writing should not be forced to do so.

We also recommend that the Department of Writing Studies continue the practice of involving the most motivated and talented graduate students in assisting with writing program administration. Finally, we recommend that graduate students have opportunities, through selective processes, to work in the Writing Center.

9. Design additional professional-development opportunities for all instructional personnel.

Although the Writing Program has done an admirable job of including training in the TA and new instructor contracts, two weeks of training in writing theory and pedagogy at the beginning of the year is not enough for all groups who teach writing. Despite their heavy teaching loads and commitment to students, FTLs, FTIs, and PTIs express the desire to continue their own writing, creative production, and professional development as teachers of writing.

Instructional staff have only recently been given incentives and opportunities to participate in faculty development beyond the orientation. These need to continue to be supported, developed, and expanded so that there is more of a community of teachers whose pedagogy is informed by current research. Although graduate students take a pedagogy course, it needs to be further buoyed by theory. Further, graduate students’ work in the classroom needs to be supported with a continued network of mentoring. The current configuration of these efforts is excellent, but participants need to be supported and rewarded for their efforts and work.

We recommend the use of resources to bolster and expand the professional development of FTLs, FTIs, PTIs, and TAs with continued discussion groups devoted to research on writing and praxis. For example, evidence suggests that peer interaction, a common pedagogical practice in writing courses, can positively affect student retention; however,
instructional personnel need to be familiar with the best practices in peer review, collaborative writing, and small-group discussion to successfully implement these practices.

Consistency of writing instruction can be achieved most effectively with the development of a professional community. Establishing a Department of Writing Studies will be the first step towards crafting a comprehensive professional-development plan for delivering research-informed writing instruction. Within a writing program, this consistency in instruction is fostered through the following kinds of efforts:

a. Continuous professional-development opportunities for permanent writing instructors (tenure-line faculty, lecturers, and instructors);

b. Theoretical and pedagogical training of graduate students teaching in the unit;

c. The establishment of a collaborative professional community: opportunities to pool expertise to develop curriculum, design assessment and evaluate its results; mutual and continuous professional mentoring; collaborative research projects; teaching/learning communities; physical space that encourages, even demands, daily contact and conversation among department members.

d. Formative and summative writing program assessment that informs the curriculum and professional development.

10. Develop an undergraduate degree (major, minor, certificate) in Writing Studies that is consistent with the mission of the new unit and with the university’s new core curriculum and strategic plan that links it closely with the community.

Using Rowan University’s graduate program (http://www.rowan.edu/open/depts/writing/) as a model, we envision a vibrant department with an innovative undergraduate writing major. Students could take a set of required courses that introduces them to writing studies and then focus on a track that is determined by the Writing Studies faculty as part of their planning of the new unit (e.g., the public intellectual; the writing arts and the community). This concentration would constitute a departmental identity unique to the University of Kentucky, but we suggest an additional concentration also be considered, one that would draw on the mission of the institution and the University Studies Program under consideration. This concentration would use the required courses for the major as a foundation for a uniquely individual program, wherein students could, with guidance and approval, design their own areas of writing emphasis: students would select courses from across the university that provide the focus for their writing emphases (e.g., writing in the technical sciences; social science research and writing; philosophical arguments in medical ethics). In this way, the writing major could serve its own students as well as students from any discipline interested in a double major. In addition to a major, the department should also consider a minor and a certificate to meet the needs of a wide range of students whose primary interests may lie elsewhere. An undergraduate degree in writing studies that
capitalizes on student interests and the university’s disciplinary resources would prepare undergraduates for employment or graduate work in a number of areas.

Current faculty members’ existing expertise in creative writing, their emphasis on the public intellectual, the strong bones that support the first-year writing program, and the institutional opportunities that now exist for promoting professional, technical, and disciplinary writing make this proposal feasible. Strong administrative support in the Office of the Provost and in the College of Arts and Sciences assures us that such a proposal will be supported and that resources will be found to build a strong, research-active writing program with faculty necessary to its implementation and growth. It is on this basis that we make these recommendations.

11. Foster greater collaboration among the Department of Writing Studies, the Writing Center, and the Writing Initiative to avoid mission confusion and to develop intellectual synergies that serve the University of Kentucky.

Now that there has been faculty senate buy-in and administrative support for the Writing Initiative, and the pilot has gathered evidence about what works and what constitutes faculty concerns, we encourage stakeholders to reconsider how the programs might all move forward.

We recommend a collaborative agreement among the Writing Initiative, the Writing Center, and the new Department of Writing Studies that would coordinate their efforts, share resources as appropriate, provide opportunities for new writing majors and graduate students, and foster a common mission. Because of their expertise, some individuals may have rotating responsibilities in two or even all three areas. However, given all that needs to be accomplished in the next few years (including morale building), these faculty should not be expected to do more than is reasonable.

Writing at the University of Kentucky could be enhanced through regular meetings of leaders from the Department of Writing Studies, the Writing Center, and the Writing Initiative. Because a new unit would be able to shape a foundation on which writing-intensive courses could be built, it may be fruitful to reconsider what constitutes a writing-intensive course. Along with research gathered by other writing-intensive programs (see, for example, http://wac.colostate.edu), the University of Kentucky could analyze the current data collected by the three-year pilot to consider, for example, what constitutes a writing-intensive course (emphasizing writing to learn and learning to write rather than the length of particular papers produced). With new hires, the role of digital production and discipline-specific types of writing and communication might be reconsidered as what “counts” as writing (e.g., formal, informal, digital, visual) in writing-intensive courses. These conversations could be all the richer if they engage an expanded writing community of experts.

Future efforts need to avoid splintering the Writing Initiative efforts, resulting in haves and have-nots and alienated departments. An expanded writing community in the form of a department, working in concert with the Writing Initiative would help ensure that more
general workshops inform faculty about what the Writing Initiative is and what it can do to foster learning while improving writing on campus. The Writing Initiative needs an associate director, or a full-time Writing Initiative professional (tenure-line) as does the Writing Center; both would benefit from continued graduate student participation. Shared resources (staff) as well as research (intellectual capital) from the hiring noted earlier in this report would need to be carefully spelled out so that current conditions (overworked staff, low morale) do not repeat themselves in five years as each program grows.

12. Build on current assessment practices to foster ongoing improvements in writing instruction.

The previous recommendations can continue to be supported by assessment of writing not only in the first year, but across the university curriculum to see how effectively the first-year program provides a basis for subsequent writing. These assessments would be folded into the construction, assessment, and delivery of first-year writing and into the reward system for all teachers of writing. Such assessments would also depend on well-constructed evaluation of the Writing Initiative because the two go hand in hand. Similarly, research in the Writing Center (who uses it, how often, how effective, whether it meets discipline specific expectations and how) can help inform the Writing Initiative and Writing Studies assessments.

All tenure-line writing faculty should also periodically and regularly teach first-year writing so that unit decisions are based not only on particular expertise and perspectives, but applied to actual students and the first-year course.

We recommend that assessment and continued participation of faculty and staff at all levels help the writing program develop ways to provide highly effective, consistent, theoretically informed writing instruction.

Implementation Timeline

At the request of Dean Steven Hoch, we suggest the following three-year timeline for implementing the recommendations included in this report. This timeline may need to be adjusted to fit policies and procedures of the University of Kentucky and the Kentucky Council on Postsecondary Education.

2008-2009

1. Provide a summer 2008 stipend for key Writing Program stakeholders to begin researching models for shaping the new department, including possible policies and procedures for the unit.
2. Facilitate discussions to refine the administrative structure for the forthcoming Department of Writing Studies.
3. With the college and the provost’s office, develop a realistic five-year budget for start-up and maintenance of the new unit.
4. Provide reassigned time for selected Full-Time Lecturers to help shape new curriculum.
5. Provide reassigned time for selected Full-Time Lecturers to develop/revise policies and procedures for the unit.
6. Hire a post-doc to serve on the design team—preferably someone from an institution with an independent writing program/department. This person might be hired before fall 2008.
7. Facilitate discussions to foster synergies among Writing Studies, the Writing Center, and the Writing Initiative.
8. Determine whether creative writing faculty wish to join the writing studies department.
9. Determine whether Randall Roorda wishes to direct/chair the new department. If not, hire a tenured faculty member (advanced associate, preferably a full professor) to serve as the director/chair.
10. Conduct national searches for two of the tenure-line faculty positions described above.
11. Hire one or two Full-Time Lecturers with terminal degree(s) in rhetoric and composition.
12. Develop guidelines for determining teaching loads of Full-Time Lecturers and Full-Time Instructors who have administrative and/or supervisory responsibilities.
13. Convert some Part-Time Instructors to Full-Time Instructors.

2009-2010

1. When more tenure-line faculty are in place, facilitate discussions to plan details for a degree in writing studies, including a major, a minor, and a certificate.
2. Conduct national search(es) for one or two of the tenure-line (tenured or tenure-track) faculty described above.
3. Hire one or two Full-Time Lecturers with terminal degree(s) in rhetoric and composition.
4. Before additional faculty are hired, revise the promotion/tenure criteria to fit the profiles of typical faculty in rhetoric and composition. A post-doc could assist tenure-line faculty with this.
5. Craft policies and procedures for the new unit, ones that are consistent with the university culture.
6. Begin hiring teaching assistants from across the university.

2010-2011

1. Conduct national search(es) for one or two of the tenure-line faculty described above.
2. The new Department of Writing Studies is operational.
3. Establish adequate space and other resources for the next five years.

People With Whom We Met at the University of Kentucky
Leonidas Bachas, Associate Dean for Research and Academic Programs, College of Arts and Sciences
Virginia Blum, Faculty, English
Heather Caddell, Teaching Associate, Writing Program
Allison Caldwell, Writing Program Mentor
Thomas Clayton, Chair, Department of English
Beth Connors-Manke, Former Writing Program Intern
Janet Eldred, Director, Writing Center and Writing Initiative
Kelly Feinberg, Instructor, Writing Program
Walter Foreman, Acting Director of Undergraduate Studies, English
Hannah Freeman, Teaching Assistant, Writing Program
Jeff Gross, Writing Program Intern
Phil Harling, Associate Dean of Faculty, College of Arts and Sciences
Steven Hoch, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
Seth Holler, Teaching Assistant, Writing Program
Randolph Hollingsworth, Assistant Provost for Integrated Academic Services
Pearl James, Faculty Member, Department of English
Dax Jennings, Writing Program Mentor
Andrew Johnson, Teaching Assistant, Writing Program
Connie Kendall, Former Director, Writing Program
Deborah Kirkman, Assistant Director, Writing Program
Philip Kraemer, Assistant Provost for Undergraduate Education
Alan Nadel, Faculty, English
Gurney Norman, Director of Creative Writing, English
Katherine Osborne, Writing Program Mentor
Armando Prats, Faculty, English
Judy Prats, Full-Time Lecturer, Writing Program
Erik Reece, Writing Program Mentor
Morgan Richards, Teaching Assistant, English
Randall Roorda, Director, Writing Program
Richard Smith, Part-Time Instructor, Writing Program
Andrew Stone, President, Graduate Student Association, English
Darci Thoune, Associate Director, Writing Program

Undergraduate Students

Rose, first-year student
Melanie, graduating senior