

WPA

Writing Program Administration

Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators
Volume 4, Number 2, Winter, 1980

Editor

Kenneth A. Bruffee, Brooklyn College, CUNY

Managing Editor

Richard Sterling, Lehman College, CUNY

Editorial Board

Enid E. Bogle, Howard University (1978-80)

Dee Brock, Dallas County Community College (1979-81)

Timothy Donovan, Northeastern University (1978-80)

Maxine Hairston, University of Texas (1980-82)

Richard Marius, Harvard University (1980-82)

David Rankin, California State University, Dominguez Hills (1979-81)

Nancy Sommers, University of Oklahoma (1979-81)

Nathaniel Teich, University of Oregon (1978-80)

William F. Woods, Wichita State University (1980-82)

WPA: Writing Program Administration is published three times a year—fall, winter, and spring—by the Council of Writing Program Administrators and the Office of College Information and Publications, Brooklyn College, City University of New York.

The Editors of *WPA* invite contributions that are appropriate to the interests and concerns of those who administer writing programs in American and Canadian colleges and universities. Articles on teaching writing or research in composition are acceptable only if they deal with the relationship of these activities to program administration.

Article length (flexible), 2,000-4,000 words. Authors should submit two copies and retain a copy for their own files. Material should be suitably documented, using the *MLA Handbook*, although as much reference as possible should be included within the text. Annotated bibliographies accompanying articles are encouraged, as well as any other apparatus which might make material more conceptually and practically valuable to working writing program administrators. The editors reserve the right to edit manuscripts accepted for publication to conform with the style of the journal. Article deadlines: fall and winter issues, January 15; spring issue, September 15. Relevant announcements are also acceptable. Announcement deadlines: fall issue, August 1; winter issue, October 1; spring issue, January 5. Address contributions and editorial correspondence to Kenneth A. Bruffee, Editor, *WPA*, English Department, Brooklyn College, CUNY, Brooklyn, New York 11210.

Subscription with membership in the Council of Writing Program Administrators: \$10/year (\$11.50 outside U.S.). Institutional subscription: \$20/year (\$21.50 outside U.S.). Single copies, \$5 (\$5.50 outside U.S.). Make check or money order payable to Council of Writing Program Administrators. Address subscription and membership correspondence to Joseph Comprone, Treasurer, *WPA*, English Department, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky 40208.

Address advertising inquiries to Richard Sterling, Managing Editor, *WPA*, English Department, Lehman College, CUNY, Bronx, New York 10468.

The Council of Writing Program Administrators is a national association of college and university faculty who serve or have served as directors of freshman composition, coordinators of writing labs and workshops, chairs and members of writing program-related committees, or in similar administrative capacities. The Council of Writing Program Administrators is an affiliate of the Association of American Colleges.

President

Harvey Wiener, La Guardia Community College, CUNY

Vice-President

Winifred Horner, University of Missouri, Columbia

Treasurer

Joseph Comprone, University of Louisville

Secretary

Arthur Dixon, J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College, Richmond, Virginia

Board of Directors

David Bartholomae, University of Pittsburgh (1980)

Harry Crosby, Boston University (1980)

Maxine Hairston, University of Texas, Austin (1981)

E.D. Hirsch, Jr., University of Virginia, Charlottesville (1981)

Elaine Maimon, Beaver College (1980)

John Warnock, University of Wyoming, Laramie (1981)

Contents

*The Council of Writing Program Administrators announces
its affiliation with the Association of American Colleges.*

Forum. Faculty development in composition	
I. Faculty indifference to writing: A pessimistic view <i>Richard Marius</i>	7
II. Faculty development through professional collaboration <i>Robert Lyons</i>	12
III. Helping faculty make rewarding assignments <i>Ellen Nold</i>	19
IV. Six steps toward departmental engagement in composition <i>Thomas Bonner, Jr.</i>	20
V. Three kinds of writing workshops for English teachers <i>Barbara Brothers</i>	21
Writing Program Evaluation: An outline for self-study <i>WPA Board of Consultant Educators</i>	23

Copyright © 1980 by the Council of Writing Program Administrators

A common-sense approach to administration <i>David Rankin</i>	29
Notes on contributors	35
Announcements	37
In the spring issue	39

Forum

Faculty development in composition

As a result of the current fiscal crunch in higher education, declining enrollment in English literature courses, and lack of writing ability among undergraduates generally, senior faculty in many institutions have been forced recently to return to teaching composition. This fact has made it necessary for WPAs and English department chairs to find ways to help these highly trained faculty, deeply committed in other areas of the profession, to undertake this new or renewed responsibility.

Harvey Wiener, President of the Council of Writing Program Administrators, invited several experienced WPAs and department chairs to address this problem at WPA-sponsored sessions during the 1979 MLA convention in San Francisco and the 1980 CCCC convention in Washington. WPA would like to be able to publish every one of these fine contributions. Space limitations permit us, however, to publish only two papers in full and only the most salient portions of others. We are most grateful to those whose work we have had to excerpt in this way for allowing us to share their ideas with our readers in abbreviated form.

I. Faculty indifference to writing: A pessimistic view *Richard Marius*

I have been asked to make a few remarks on enlisting the aid of senior faculty in teaching writing. I want to begin with the pessimistic observation that getting senior faculty to teach writing is almost impossible.

We can all point to exceptions, in both individuals and institutions. The University of Illinois, I believe, requires that every senior faculty member in the English department teach one course in composition at least every four years. Louis Martz, one of Yale's most distinguished scholars, was the chief lecturer in Yale's popular writing course, *Daily Themes*, in 1980. At Maryland, every department in the college of liberal arts must furnish someone to teach composition each term or else supply from the department budget a sum that will pay someone else to do the job—a kind of academic bounty system. And we can all mention

this or that important individual exception, the man or woman who will insist that students write well and will make an effort to see that they do.

But, for the most part, I believe *we* face a nearly unbroken wall of indifference on the part of senior faculty to the notion that they have any responsibility at all to help students write well. They would much rather *curse* the dark than light a candle.

My own entry into this field came through the back door-one might even say the basement door. It taught me a lot about the reaction of colleagues to the teaching of writing. I feel quite tolerant about these reactions-tolerant and resigned.

I taught European history for 14 years at my undergraduate college, the University of *Tennessee*, Knoxville. There I became deeply concerned because my students could not write coherent papers. I wanted them to make arguments, to keep everything in their papers related to one theme, to make their last paragraph say something about the first without indulging in the useless pomposity of saying, "In conclusion I have proved that...." I wanted them to use the English language well, or at least to use it idiomatically, so the reader did not have to keep going over their prose to see what on earth it might mean.

I assigned term papers, and I spent a lot of time marking those papers to show the writers how to make better arguments, how to use the language more effectively, how to say what I thought they really wanted to say. But students who handed papers in at the end of the term seldom came by to pick them up. They were interested only in their grade. Once they knew that solemn fact, they were uninterested in anything else I had to say about their work, including anything I had to say about how they wrote the English language.

I was doubtful about the wisdom of midterm exams and finals. I did not believe students remembered much about an exam after it was over. So, in addition to writing well, my students, I thought, should carry something lasting with them out of the course. As it was, I thought the things they remembered best were the humorous anecdotes I told to illustrate some point. They seldom remembered the point itself. I thought they might remember the subject of an eight-page paper they had spent two weeks writing.

So, about 1971, I got rid of the midterm and final, those hallowed old institutions without which universities are supposed to collapse and civilizations decay. I got rid of the long term paper, the pillar of scholarship and discipline in academe. Instead of these, I assigned an eight-page paper every two weeks in my course in the history of thought from Machiavelli to Montaigne. I told my students that they could never tell me, "I know it, but I just can't write it." I said a thousand times, "If you can't write it, you don't really know it." Students said to me in great earnestness, pointing at some gibberish on their papers, "But what I mean is....," and I said, "Mr. Beanblossom, if you have to tell me what you mean, you have not succeeded in this paper." I recall the anguished recognition of one student who cried out one day in the midst of discussion, "I thought this was a history course, and it isn't. It's a course *on rhetoric!*" He spoke in the tone of one *who* had just discovered a cockroach in his soup. In fact it was a history course, but it was also a course in thinking, and thinking is inseparable from rhetoric in any of the liberal arts.

Now, it is not my purpose to relive those years and to discuss what I learned

about teaching writing. I am-like all of you-ready to discuss these matters at the drop of a semicolon, but this is not the time to preach to the converted. I might digress long enough to recall that my mother was a member of a religious sect with a number of unique and bizarre beliefs, and I recall how avidly the members of her little group got together to comfort each other for the indifference of the world and to give testimony about their own steadfast devotion in the midst of persecution. Now when writing teachers get together I seem to hear the ghost of that old spirit of my mother's sect stirring through our talk.

I want only to report the reaction of my colleagues to my own strange behavior. My department chair caught a bad case of the glooms because enrollment quickly dropped in my class from around 50 students to 18. We got money from the state according to the number of credit hours we produced, and department chairs have to be concerned about such things. I hasten to add that within a couple of years my enrollment climbed back into the forties. A lot of engineering students and some from business administration and even some from education were willing to suffer Machiavelli to Montaigne so they could learn to write a coherent essay.

I must again digress to say that it is one of the highest academic ironies that students today yearn to learn how to write well and that senior faculty do not want to teach them. My department chair never gave me a word of encouragement for teaching writing. He never inquired into my methods or my philosophy. He never made any remarks about the labor I expended in grading all those papers. He only expressed his fears about enrollment. Nor did any of my colleagues show any interest in what I was doing. I do not blame them for their attitude. Most of them were good and true, hardworking and devoted. I only note the symbolic importance of their indifference to the teaching of writing, for it is an attitude shared by most senior faculty members in all departments in all universities.

I was somewhat surprised by the indifference of our own English Department at Tennessee. I ran my advanced course as a writing course for seven years. With great effort, I converted my freshman history survey into a similar course. Students liked it, though they worked very hard. Yet no one in our English Department ever asked me a single question about what I was doing or what I was learning. When I came to Harvard to direct the Expository Writing Program, the English Department at Tennessee-a distinguished department, I might add-had me down to lecture on what I was doing. I was glad to go back to Tennessee at the department's expense. Tennessee is my home, and I have always loved my state and my alma mater. But I did comment on the irony of the invitation. At any time during the previous seven years I could have descended five floors in the elevator and given the same lecture that I was giving them at the cost of an airline ticket and honorarium, and I would have done it for nothing. But nobody asked.

Why are senior faculty so indifferent to our task? For one reason, they are not rewarded for it. Teaching students to write well does not bring the public acclaim that is stirred by the brilliant lecture. It brings nothing like the distinction of publishing the great book, though I want to make another digression to say that writing teachers should themselves regularly publish and that their publications should not all be about teaching writing.

We also need to look at an even more obvious reason for the reluctance of

senior faculty to undertake our task. Most academics in this country write abominably, and they could not teach writing if they tried. I don't know if you have noticed, but articles in *PMLA* are seldom anything one reads for pleasure, I seldom find in any of them a phrase I want to repeat to my friends or even a phrase I can remember. Yet these articles represent—we must all agree—the best in our profession.

We have to keep their inability to write in mind when we talk about getting senior faculty involved in the teaching of writing. Maybe we don't want them. We may be summoning up the captain of the Titanic to direct our naval operations. At least we ought not assume unquestioningly that senior faculty members are necessarily good writing teachers just because they are senior faculty members.

We must also deal with another problem that strikes me as more difficult than we have thought. Teaching writing involves the teacher with the student in ways that are not superficial. Writing is an intimate act, and when we criticize people for their intimate acts, they do not respond cheerfully. One of the hardest tasks any teacher must perform is to put a grade on a piece of writing. I think writing should be graded and graded rigorously. But I also think grades should be justified to students. That is a time-consuming and emotionally wearing business, one that senior faculty members do not like to undertake. Often, senior faculty members in such a situation must make a psychological leap that most older teachers find uncomfortable.

The reason for this discomfort may be that, if you will pardon the cliché, we continue to endure today an abysmal division between the generations. The old and the young are more divided than they ever have been, and one ancient pattern has been turned upside down. For centuries the young have aspired to be like the old. It was not so very long ago that the ideal man was middle-aged and plump—his corpulence showing something of his achievement in the world, an achievement the young wanted to emulate. But now the old aspire to be like the young. Age, even more than death, has become the great enemy of our souls, the reality we would all most like to translate into illusion.

This antipathy to age militates against writing. Writing is one of the traditional arts. It always represents rules, discipline, and tradition. And one reason senior faculty members have trouble when they teach writing is that they feel threatened when they try to pass on rules to the young. The free spirit of the young makes people past forty feel uncomfortable when they seek to hand on the tradition, for tradition is always an obstacle to some kinds of freedom. It is always much easier for a senior professor to do research, which is often a kind of solitary looking in a mirror, a satisfying form of narcissism, than it is to descend into the common street to give people direction.

In colleges of any size, the division between the old and the young is made still more profound by the insertion of the teaching assistant between students and the teacher in charge of the course. Teaching assistants lead the discussions, often make up the exams, and nearly always grade the papers. Senior faculty members are left to look at students from a comfortable distance—much like visitors to a zoo eyeing the tigers. But no one ever taught writing from a distance.

So there you have my pessimistic appraisal of our subject. Is there anything we can do? Let me rephrase the problem just a bit and suggest a direction. The problem is really this: How do we get a whole institution, not just the English

composition teachers, to become engaged in the teaching of writing?

Obviously, we should seek qualified senior *faculty* members to help us. When we know we have good writers among the senior faculty, we should do our best to persuade them to convey something of their craft to *students*. We need to persuade senior faculty members to assign more writing to their students. We should do all we can to make the multiple-choice exam contemptible. And we should lobby continually against the old heresy that style is cosmetic and not truly related to substance. Ever on our lips should be the gospel that good writing is good thinking and that bad writing is bad thinking. Perhaps my religious metaphor should be extended; we might need some training in the uses of religion—or psychology—to help us become expert in inducing guilt.

I have one other suggestion that may offset the fundamental fact of our times, that senior faculty members are not going to help us very much. My own scheme at Harvard is to try to get a hold on the young teaching assistants and teaching fellows in courses throughout the college. I am trying to get Harvard's administration to let me and others in our program train all teaching assistants in courses offered in our core curriculum. I want to show them how to look at a paper to see if it is written well, and I want to persuade them that a mere listing of nouns on the subject being discussed is not in itself proof that the student throwing those nouns into a paper really knows the material. I want to get these young teaching assistants to have a certain confidence in their own judgement. For my feeling is that when readers cannot understand what a writer is saying, the writer usually does not know what he or she has tried to say. Young section leaders, insecure in their own judgements especially among very bright undergraduates, are likely to keep looking at a paper until they find some truth in it. But such a search shows, to my mind at least, that the paper has already failed in a fundamental way.

So here is the end of my tale. The sum of my feeling about our prospects is that no sudden revolution is going to change things, and we are not going to be saved by gimmicks. We have a long, hard road to walk, and I do not see many senior faculty members up there with their hands outstretched to help us. But perhaps if we start inculcating our ideals in the young teachers who will be the profession of tomorrow, with the help of administrations that are usually much more willing to change than are senior faculty members, we may have just a chance to avoid discussing this same problem under similar conditions 20 years from now.

II. Faculty development through professional collaboration

Robert Lyons

When we consider the issue of how to introduce or reintroduce experienced teachers of literature to composition, we can usefully begin by comparing their particular situation with that of other groups new to this kind of teaching. I would like quickly to survey the types of faculty now commonly trained to teach composition in our colleges and the ways that have been established for training them. These will be very broad categories and, I am sure, familiar ones.

The first category of people we find ourselves training includes graduate students and other young and inexperienced teachers, new not only to teaching composition but to any classroom teaching at all. Most commonly, these new teachers attend a seminar—the usual setting in graduate education. In more fortunate cases, they are given some kind of concurrent experience teaching writing as a tutor, as a staff member in a language lab or writing center, or as a classroom teacher in the college's composition program.

A second group consists of college teachers of all ranks and from all departments who are asked to participate in programs designed to make them more aware of the need to emphasize writing in their own discipline. Such a training program is part of a by now well-publicized effort to teach writing throughout the college curriculum. The program often involves a committee with representatives from many disciplines who will return to their departments and proselytize their colleagues in an enlightened way to pay greater attention to writing. To guide the faculty, the committee often prepares a handbook or other sample materials designed for particular disciplines. Alternatively, some colleges offer more direct instruction, gathering members of the faculty for several days or even weeks in workshops on composition, planned and presented by the English Department or by some outside authority in the field of composition.

In a third group are senior, tenured members of departments other than English whose courses have been canceled due to low enrollments and who are reassigned to teaching writing. The most common shift of this kind today involves teachers of foreign languages, but they are by no means the only faculty members who discover they have, with very little warning, been impressed into a new career. The college usually offers some kind of intensive training for such teachers. They may work closely with one or two members of the regular composition staff or, in the best of circumstances, they may be granted a semester of released time to participate in a formal retraining program before taking on new teaching duties.

The fourth and final group I will mention are teachers of English, senior members of the department who have not taught writing for a number of years. These faculty members are now teaching composition because shrinking budgets and low enrollments have reduced both the staff and the number of electives in the English Department or because the college has mandated an expanded writing requirement. I am particularly familiar with this group, since my own department at Queens College includes many able teachers of literature who have only recently had to resume teaching in the composition program. These teachers would understandably prefer to teach their specialties, but they generally accept the composition assignment as a professional responsibility, even if they approach it with some uncertainty and reluctance.

There has been, to date, no program in my department, however, to retrain such teachers. In fact, there have been few systematic efforts on the college level specifically designed to help experienced English teachers returning to composition. Why, we may reasonably ask, is this most important group not being served by the resources devoted to training other groups of composition teachers?

Why retraining is difficult to accomplish. The reason this important group remains neglected seems to be that the very notion of retraining senior members of the faculty provokes a good deal of personal and professional discomfort. If we think about the different situations in which the four groups of teachers I have listed find themselves, we may gain a clearer understanding of why this is the case. Teachers in all the other groups mentioned have had no experience in teaching writing. They may be eager or hesitant, but they all recognize the usefulness of some systematic preparation for such teaching. The graduate student is used to being a learner, subordinated to many mentors. Indeed, graduate students often welcome training in teaching writing because, especially when practical experience is involved, it often gives them more autonomy than most other graduate courses provide. History or psychology teachers who participate in a writing-across-the-curriculum project are really part of a collaborative venture. They exchange their knowledge of the forms of discourse particularly important in their disciplines for some suggestions about effective strategies to teach those forms. In addition, they have the reassuring feeling that they are doing something beyond the usual academic requirements, making a distinct contribution to the improvement of written expression. Even the teacher reassigned to composition from another discipline has at least the support and sympathy of colleagues who recognize the difficulty of the adjustment.

But senior professors of English have none of these incentives or consolations. They have spent a good many of their early years in the profession teaching a good many sections of composition. They left such teaching not because they were doing it poorly but because it was a recognized stage of apprenticeship on the way to becoming a teacher and scholar of literature. The idea that teaching composition now requires retraining sounds patronizing or even insulting, for it suggests not only a return to junior status but also an implicit judgment about the work of earlier years. Why should experienced teachers of English need to be retrained to teach writing unless their teaching has been markedly unsatisfactory?

The reluctance of experienced English teachers to consent to retraining is also understandable when we consider the familiar justifications that English depart-

merits use to explain their monopoly control over writing courses and composition programs. English teachers are assumed to possess a special sensitivity to the nuances of the English language, to the shapes of English sentences, and to the formal arrangements of different modes of English discourse. The literature teacher simply attends to these subjects in a different way' in the composition class. And English teachers assume implicitly that anybody (that is, any English teacher) can teach composition. Because of these assumptions, senior professors who in recent years have been teaching literature exclusively do not feel that their work has taken them far from composition. They believe the attention they give to the uses of the written language in their literature classes keeps them reasonably close to the concerns of a composition teacher. Furthermore, literature teachers often feel they maintain their role as writing teachers in their elective courses by continuing to assign papers, never having given in to the flood of short-answer and multiple-choice forms that now make writing across the curriculum such an urgent academic issue. Not only do such professors think of themselves as writing teachers because of their years of apprenticeship, but also because they are still committed to standards of writing competence in their literature courses.

When senior professors contemplating retraining look around their own department and discuss their consternation with the people they have worked with for many years, their discontents will almost surely find a choral accompaniment. Commonly, the department's composition specialists (and perhaps even using the plural is an exaggeration) are among its junior members, fairly recently recruited to bring order and purpose to the writing program and show that the department was responsive to the college's concern for improved basic skills. Even when composition specialists do occupy a more prominent position, they are most assuredly a minority voice in a department whose faculty are primarily trained in and committed to literature. And finally, however persuasively composition teachers present their case, experienced professors are well aware that composition is a field in which debates about purposes and methods have been long and arduous and never convincingly resolved. They are likely to take comfort with their colleagues in the feeling that they have maintained standards, resisted compromise, and remained impervious to the latest popular panaceas.

I intend this overview of the situation of senior English professors to be sympathetic, not ironic. It seems to me that their circumstances—both internal and external—provide understandable reasons for them to be less than cooperative with plans to retrain them as teachers of writing. Retraining senior professors, as I have sketched it, is not a process that will get an enthusiastic response or will lead to the swift transformation of a composition program. The trainees do not feel they need a reeducation, the trainers are a vulnerable minority, and the usual occasions for training, the staff *meeting* or faculty workshop, do not serve the broader purpose of rethinking one's role as a composition teacher. Under these circumstances, the idea of retraining will have to be replaced by another conception, a special kind of collaborative effort, if we are to make any headway.

A program of professional collaboration. The initiative in establishing a cooperative effort must come from the English Department and its administrators. The department's goal, in fact, should not be retraining, but rather develop

ing among more teachers a serious professional interest in composition.

The department head can begin this effort by affirming that composition is an important concern for full-time faculty and that it will continue to be a regular teaching responsibility. Too often, English Department heads try to placate teachers by telling them that a composition course assignment is a stopgap measure to tide things over, thereby reinforcing the idea that the course should be recognized as an unwanted burden.

Second, the department head should point to the substantial evidence that most college freshmen are less skilled writers than their counterparts were a decade ago. I will not recount the familiar litany of reasons for this situation, but the fact that such a litany exists proves that writing problems are not confined to a small, identifiable group of underprepared students. The department head needs to emphasize that the inability to write well is now a widespread problem and therefore a major responsibility.

Third, the department head should remind teachers of literature courses that, although they may think they have already adjusted to teaching students with less developed writing abilities, their literature students have been a self-selected minority of the college population. Teaching a composition course will mean working with students who have very basic problems as writers and who do not consider the liberal arts as a significant part of their college education. For the most part, teachers in literature courses have had in the past a different kind of involvement with student writing. They have expected good writing, advocated it, and rewarded it. But they have not actually taught writing, except in so far as some comments in the margins of a completed essay might influence a student in writing a subsequent essay. Literature teachers, then, need to consider, in the light of a new situation, how writers can establish their skills or improve them. They need to determine where and how to intervene in helping poorly prepared writers develop.

A departmental statement of the kind I have just described, emphasizing both the importance of the task of teaching composition and the changed nature of the task, is a first step in engaging the attention of senior teachers. The purpose of gaining their attention is to secure agreement on one point: that today, students are entering college composition at a different level of preparedness than in the past. This agreement will justify the department in sponsoring a common effort by its senior faculty to review the teaching of composition. Such a review should follow whatever form collegial work in the department customarily takes. If most work is done through committees, then a committee of senior faculty should be established to consider the responsibilities of the composition teacher.

The faculty participants in the group obviously should not usurp any of the policy making functions of the writing program administrator. They should serve the department in an advisory role. To ensure some sense of purpose, the group should have an explicit goal, one determined by the needs of the department. All other things being equal, my own suggestion would be that the group prepare a model training program for new teachers or review an existing program. At the same time, the implicit aims of the group effort will be, first, to familiarize senior faculty involved in the group with recent publications in composition, and, second, to draw their attention to some student writing problems that they may not previously have addressed directly in the composition classroom. These two

activities, connecting the theoretical and the practical, will encourage senior faculty to reevaluate their approaches to teaching composition and to ask again Walker Gibson's useful question, "What do I mean by good writing, and what does that have to do with the young people in my class at 9:05 a.m. on Monday, Wednesday and Friday?"

The first activity of this faculty group, then, should be to read and discuss several books or articles that would together give them an overview of recent and impressive work being done in composition theory. The point to emphasize is that this material is not being "taught" to anyone, since all members of the group would be peers. Instead, the material would be jointly explored as a way of gaining insight about composition. Writers such as James Britton, Janet Emig, James Moffett, and Mina Shaughnessy would provide valuable perspectives on the teaching of writing. They would also demonstrate to faculty trained in literature that composition is not exclusively a matter of textbooks, but that thoughtful and well-written research, parallel to similar work in their own particular fields, already exists. Other work, like that of E.D. Hirsch Jr. or Wayne Booth, can demonstrate the connections between literary theory and composition theory and can also testify to the way someone trained in literature might expand his or her professional interests to include research relevant to the teaching of composition.

Any planning for this sort of endeavor should begin with Richard Larson's valuable article, "Resources for the Veteran Teacher, New to Composition." Larson has provided sensible criteria for choosing readings, and he has also compiled a short list of articles and books that he finds of particular value in introducing a faculty member to new directions in teaching composition. My own list would be a still shorter one, however, given the many demands on the time of senior faculty. The list would not, of course, be an honor roll of the four or five best statements about composition. It would reflect a range of concerns, including rhetorical theory, since that would already be a subject of interest to literature teachers. It would also include work on the composing process and on the way students develop their abilities as writers, as well as, when appropriate, more detailed discussion of the problems of seriously underprepared writers.* I would supplement my list not only with Larson's recommendations, but also with citations in *Teaching Composition*, a volume of bibliographic essays edited by Gary Tate, to offer faculty more guidance if they wanted to explore a topic in greater depth.

The reading list I have described is much more modest than one that might be used in a graduate seminar in teaching writing. Composition specialists may find it difficult to restrict themselves to such a limited introduction to their field. Recent surveys of the discipline mark out as essential reading an imposing list of works from many areas. The length of this list reflects, in part, the value to composition teachers of some familiarity with the history and structure of languages and with the biological, psychological, and sociological characteristics of language users. It may also reflect a new sense of academic respectability, a kind of intellectual muscle flexing, attempting to prove that composition can sustain its own graduate curriculum with bibliographies at least as long as those in any other discipline. However, the object of convening senior faculty returning to composition should not be to overwhelm them with a sense of how much there is to be known, but to provide a bridge whereby their language interests and

their ideas about rhetoric can be extended and expanded toward an interest in composition.

Larson would agree. He observes that teachers now specializing in literature are likely to respond most favorably to "imaginative and incisive theory" about discourse. He urges that a reading list include "items about composition by wellknown literary scholars and practicing writers, if we find useful material by this kind of person." As Larson implies, the effort to involve senior faculty must be a gradual effort in persuasion. We have no reason to expect that experienced teachers are going to abandon the assumptions and methods that have sustained them for many years without some trepidation and without a good deal of preliminary questioning.

Discussion about composition among senior faculty should not concern itself with specific writing assignments, with the choice of a particular textbook or handbook, or with detailed guidelines establishing what teachers should do in the classroom. In fact, one of the reasons I have proposed that these discussion groups be restricted to senior faculty is to create an alternative to staff meetings and workshops where practical questions usually take precedence. To focus on these matters is to invite deadlock, because the disputed choices really reflect assumptions about how writing should be taught.

At the same time, as I said earlier, senior English professors need to reconsider what kinds of writing abilities should get substantial reinforcement in the classroom. The topics I would especially like to see discussed are fluency, invention, and revision. All have received a good deal of attention in recent research, so they are likely to be represented even in a brief reading list. And these topics are closely linked to three of the most familiar complaints of the senior teacher new to composition: My students have never done any writing, My students never have any ideas, and My students never listen to what I tell them. Concentrating on these topics, teachers returning to composition will in all likelihood be tempted to explore studies of the composing process, of systems of invention, and of stylistic options in revision as they look for ways both to encourage and actively influence student writers.

How teachers apply in the classroom what they learn about these and other topics should be left to their own judgment. Matters like fluency, invention, and revision can be addressed in any number of ways—they can even be lectured about, as an extreme example—so they can be incorporated into the writing course by teachers who may still resist considering changes in their teaching methods. To press too quickly for change in what senior teachers do in the classroom, no matter how cogent the reasons or how persuasive the demonstration of available alternatives, runs the risk of alienating these teachers to the detriment of the program.

What I am suggesting, in the end, is a policy of gradualism and cooperation but not one of benign neglect. Writing program administrators should not rush in to train the senior faculty, even if this were a practical possibility. They should encourage a departmental consensus that informed interest in composition is part of the professional responsibility of all the English faculty. They should initiate discussion that will create or sustain this professional interest. And they should be ready to provide additional support or guidance when individual faculty members request it. At the same time, they should not feel that their efforts are wasted if

only a few senior faculty show a serious, sustained interest in composition. And they should not automatically assume that an unresponsive faculty member is incapable of teaching composition effectively. If senior faculty are shown the importance of the task, if they are not patronized, and if they recognize that some distinguished academics are now involved in composition theory, we can expect that some of our most *successful teachers of composition will be* those who are now rediscovering the challenge of this important work.

Note

• A short list of readings on teaching composition.

- Booth, Wayne. "The Rhetorical Stance." *CCC*, 14 (October, 1963), 139-145.
- Britton, James. *The Development of Writing Abilities, 11-18*. London: Macmillan Education, 1975.
- Emig, Janet. "Writing as a Mode of Learning." *CCC*, 28 (May, 1977), 122-127.
- Hirsch, E.D., Jr. *The Philosophy of Composition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.
- Larson, Richard L. "Resources for the Veteran Teacher, New to Composition." *ADE Bulletin*, 58 (September, 1978), 28-32.
- Moffett, James. *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.
- Shaughnessy, Mina P. "Diving In: An Introduction to Basic Writing." *CCC*, 27 (October, 1976), 234-239.
- _____. *Errors and Expectations*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Tate, Gary, ed. *Teaching Composition: Ten Bibliographic Essays*. Fort Worth: Texas Christian University Press, 1976.

III. Helping faculty make rewarding assignments

Ellen Nold

WPAs who try to get senior faculty members-in English or any other department-to teach writing in their elective courses must begin with some well-founded assumptions about the nature of writing and the nature of faculty motivation. As for writing, improvement results from revision. As for motivation, faculty need to feel that when they teach or promote good writing, their students will actually write better.

These two assumptions lead to the following premise: that we are more likely to be successful in our efforts to get faculty to teach writing if we urge them to stress rewriting. Most writing evaluated in college courses other than writing courses per se is submitted at the end of the term and never revised. This is the term paper syndrome: the view that college writing means writing long research papers or other major documents. The way to increase faculty satisfaction with teaching writing, and in fact to improve the writing that students produce, is to urge faculty to assign fewer long end-of-term essays and instead make shorter writing assignments due earlier in the term. After marking these short papers---commenting on both content and writing technique--professors should ask students to revise their work, assuring students that revision is a normal activity in both the academic world and the world of work. And professors, in reading the revisions, will gain a strong sense that their work on their students' writing has paid off.

IV. Six steps toward departmental engagement in composition

Thomas Bonner, Jr.

The most serious problem the WPA and department chair face in a department in which suddenly everyone has to teach composition is low morale. The first order of business must be to raise it. To do this, teaching composition must be established as a common objective of the whole department.

Several steps can be taken to do this. First, senior faculty must be convinced that a comprehensive approach to teaching composition will help both themselves and the department, in part by attracting both funds and gratitude from the higher administration for a professional job well done. Second, the department must identify specific skills for each level of undergraduate instruction so that the nature of the job becomes clearly defined. Third, senior faculty, perhaps working in committee, should be encouraged to incorporate instruction in these skills into their writing and literature courses. Fourth, senior faculty should be encouraged to teach both freshman-level and advanced composition courses on grounds that by doing so they provide beginning students with the opportunity to be taught by the college's most experienced and most highly trained professors.

Fifth, travel funds and research grants under the department's control should be refocused so as to help senior faculty working in composition to attend conferences devoted to composition issues and to pursue research in this and related fields. And sixth, both the department chair and the writing program administrator should take unusual interest in senior faculty who teach composition and should go out of their way to commend them, writing letters praising their leadership, with copies to division and college deans. Naturally, all these steps must be taken with the greatest of tact and diplomacy.

V. Three kinds of writing workshops for English teachers

Barbara Brothers

In planning workshops on teaching writing at Youngstown State University, we have assumed that all faculty know something about teaching writing but need to learn more, that teaching writing is central to the English Department's undergraduate and graduate programs, and that teaching writing is the joint responsibility of senior, junior, and limited-service (part-time) faculty. We have in-service workshops for our own faculty and graduate assistants, summer graduate institutes and workshops for area teachers (K-12), and sessions for YSU faculty outside the English Department.

First, in workshops addressed to English Department faculty, we have stressed both research and classroom practices. One outside consultant, Charles Cooper, chair of NCTE's Council on Research, reviewed current research on the composing process to aid faculty in designing their own research projects as well as to encourage them to do so. Then the faculty gave examples of how the principles that Cooper had drawn from the research for teaching composition could be applied in the classroom. Another consultant, Stanley Fish of Johns Hopkins University, gave a lecture and served as a respondent to two faculty panels that examined how our assumptions about the nature of reading and writing are reflected in the various ways we teach literature and composition. (Fish's commitment to teaching writing and his knowledge of such a work as Mina Shaughnessy's *Errors and Expectations* is also a valuable example for senior faculty). To prepare for the presentations, faculty read selected publications written by the consultants.

At these workshops our own faculty have led sessions on such topics as identifying patterns of errors and strategies for reading the work of basic writers (the faculty was introduced to Shaughnessy's work and applied some of her principles to our own students' essays); writing effective assignments; using the writing center as an adjunct to teaching composition; grading papers and alternatives to grading; using the classroom as a workshop; and exploring topics through pre-writing activities.

Second, our summer graduate institutes and workshops, run by faculty who specialize in teaching writing, involve other English faculty members as consultants. We expect faculty to take part in every session and thereby learn from their colleagues. Concerned about graduate enrollment in their literature classes, many faculty have seen the workshops as opportunities to attract students to the M.A. program in English, and to their own classes, by demonstrating their involvement, competence, and interest in teaching reading and writing on all levels. To prepare for the workshops, we have compiled annotated bibliographies and a resource library on teaching composition. Periodically updated, these materials are also a valuable aid in improving the department's writing instruction.

Third, we run Professional Day workshops for high school English teachers. We plan the programs with advisers from the high schools, using as leaders consultants invited from outside, members of our own faculty, and teachers who have attended one of our graduate workshops on writing. Through these workshops we share information and experience in order to create better writing programs and better writing teachers. Newsletters supplement the workshops by providing an ongoing forum for exchanging information and ideas.

Writing program evaluation: an outline for self-study

WPA Board of Consultant Evaluators

At the CCCC conference in Washington, D.C., March 12, 1980, Harvey Wiener, president of WPA, convened a seven-hour training session for WPA's new Board of Consultant Evaluators. The meeting's goal was to initiate the WPA writing program consultation service established with the support of the Exxon Education Foundation.

The board drew upon the considerable knowledge and expertise of its members to draft a set of guidelines and standards for its own use. The following outline for self-study is based on that draft. The board is aware that the outline does not address *every* possible concern of every writing program. An outline of this sort can best serve as a heuristic: a tool that WPAs and their colleagues may find useful in reviewing their programs' goals, needs, and procedures.

Members of the WPA Board of Consultant Evaluators for 1980 are David Bartholomae, University of Pittsburgh; Kenneth A. Bruffee, Brooklyn College; Harry H. Crosby, Boston University; Ken Davis, University of Kentucky; Michael C. Flanigan, Indiana University; Maxine Hairston, University of Texas; Winifred Horner, University of Missouri-Columbia; Erika Lindemann, University of North Carolina; Elaine P. Maimon, Beaver College; Donald A. McQuade, Queens College; Ellen Nold, Stanford University; Mark E. Smith, Northern Michigan University; William Ellsworth Smith, Utah State University; Nathaniel Teich, University of Oregon; Joseph F. Trimmer, Ball State University; Harvey Wiener, La Guardia Community College; and Joseph M. Williams, University of Chicago.

Questions for writing program self-study

Curriculum

Courses and goals

1. What writing courses are currently taught? How are they related? Are they required? If so, of whom? What are their prerequisites?
2. What are the goals of the writing program? How were these goals arrived at? Are they periodically reviewed? What has been done to implement them?
3. What goals do the administration and faculty in other departments think the

writing program should have? How do the goals of the writing program accord with the goals of the institution as a whole?

4. What specific connections have been established with feeder schools (high schools, community colleges) to improve writing instruction and the quality of student preparation?

Syllabus

1. Does each writing course have a syllabus? Are the syllabuses uniform or individual?

2. Is there a logical sequence of courses, and of course units or assignments within each course? How does each syllabus relate to program goals and institutional goals?

3. Are there opportunities for faculty to share and develop syllabuses? What control does the writing program administrator have over syllabuses and their development?

4. What opportunities exist for experimentation?

5. How is class time apportioned per day, per week, and per term?

6. How much writing, and what kind of writing, must students do for each course?

7. Is the amount of assigned reading in the writing courses controlled? What is the purpose or function of reading assigned in the writing courses?

Instructional methods and materials

1. What methods are used to deal with student writing in the program's writing courses? Are these methods consistent with the program's goals?

2. What kinds of classroom activities are most common?

3. Do the writing courses use textbooks? How many and what kind (handbooks, rhetorics, anthologies, workbooks, dictionaries, etc.)? Which books are used in which courses?

4. Who makes decisions about texts? What options are available for faculty and for teaching assistants or adjunct faculty?

5. Why is the program using the textbooks it is currently using?

6. What instructional materials and media does the program use other than textbooks?

7. Does the program use student writing as instructional material? Are there reproduction facilities readily available to duplicate student work for class use?

8. Do writing teachers have adequate office space for conferring with students?

Testing

1. What tests and testing procedures does the program currently use for placement and exemption? Why are these particular tests used? Have they been

validated for the population of students they are administered to at this institution?

2. How are placement decisions made and carried out? Does the program evaluate proficiency? If so, how?

3. How are the tests administered? Who administers them? Who scores them? How are those who administer and score tests compensated? What kind of and how much compensation do they get?

4. What is the program's policy on transfer students?

Grading practices

1. What is the institution's grading system? How does the program's grading system relate to the institution's grading system?

2. How are grades determined in individual courses? Are there agreed-upon criteria? If so, how are these criteria enforced? If not, how does the program arrive at uniformity in grading?

3. How do students perceive the program's grading system? What has been done to find out?

Program administration

Institutional and program structure

1. What is the size and makeup of the department or administrative unit in which the writing program is housed? What is the governing structure of that department or unit? What percentage of full-time faculty at each rank, adjunct faculty, and graduate students teach writing?

2. How many writing courses do faculty at each rank or status teach?

3. What is the internal governing structure of the writing program? Is there a writing program administrator ("director of freshman English," "composition committee chair," etc.)? If so, what is the WPA's administrative relation to other levels of administration? To whom is the WPA responsible?

4. How is the writing program related through administration and curriculum to other departments and divisions in the institution?

5. If there are night school or nondegree programs, what control does the WPA have over the way writing is taught in those programs? How does the WPA exercise that control? What responsibility does the WPA have for the teaching of writing in other departments or colleges within the institution?

6. Where do the funds that support the writing program come from? Who administers that money? What is it spent on?

7. Who hires, promotes, tenures, salaries, and assigns courses to writing staff?

8. How are new teaching positions in the writing program determined, and by whom?

9. Who determines class size, curriculum, and teaching load?

10. How are the program's internal problems solved? Who decides on syllabuses, testing procedures, textbooks, curriculum, etc.? What *voice* do full-time faculty, part-time faculty, teaching assistants, and students have in shaping writing program policies? What permanent or *ad hoc* committees relevant to the writing program exist? How are these committees appointed? What do they do?

11. What are the procedures for negotiating complaints about grading, teaching, and administrative processes and policies?

Writing program administrator's job description

1. How is the WPA chosen?
2. What is the current WPA's academic and professional background?
3. What is the WPA's rank and tenure status? Is the WPA tenured? If not, why not?
4. What is the WPA's teaching load?
5. What is the WPA responsible for?
6. To whom is the WPA responsible?
7. How long does the WPA hold the job? Is there a specified term of appointment? What provisions are there for reviewing the quality of the WPA's work and the quality of the WPA's contribution to the writing program and institution as a whole?
8. What rewards are there for doing high-quality work as a WPA? Who grants these rewards?

Faculty development

Current conditions

1. How many full-time and part-time *people* teach writing?
2. What training and experience do these teachers have? What professional organizations do they belong to? What is their record of research, publication, and conference participation?
3. How are high-quality teaching and research rewarded, especially in terms of salary increase, promotion, and tenure?
4. What courses, speaker programs, workshops, awards, and support services does the program offer or support to encourage excellence in teaching writing? What opportunities for faculty development already exist? Who uses them? How do faculty find out about them? In what ways are faculty encouraged to avail themselves of these opportunities?
5. What kinds of work and activities occur during department or program staff meetings? How frequently are these meetings held? Who attends them?

Support for faculty development

1. How is "faculty development" defined as a goal of the institution, the depart-

ment or administrative unit, and the writing program?

2. What financial resources are available for workshops, speakers, travel to conferences, research, developing and evaluating new writing courses and new teaching techniques?

3. What is the faculty attitude toward faculty development? What is the faculty attitude toward training that is designed to improve the teaching of writing? What is the attitude of composition teachers toward literature teachers, and vice versa? What is the attitude of faculty in one area of the writing program (basic skills, technical writing, advanced composition, etc.) toward faculty in other areas of the writing program?

4. What avenues exist for writing teachers of every rank and status to design, implement, and evaluate faculty development programs best suited to their needs and interests? How are faculty encouraged to develop their skills in composition research and teaching writing? What opportunities exist for learning about faculty development programs in effect at other institutions?

5. Does the department publicly support excellence in writing through scholarships, writing contests, magazines of student writing, etc.?

6. What opportunities for faculty development are planned for the near future?

Support services

Definition

A support service is any academic or service unit that reinforces the writing program and coordinates its services with the writing program's goals, curriculum, and administrative procedures.

Organization

1. What services exist at the institution? What specific kinds of help do these services offer to students and faculty? What kinds of materials and techniques does each support service use? Does the service use a variety of materials and techniques, or does it focus mainly on one type?

2. What are the goals and instructional plans of each service? Do any services offered by the writing program and the support services overlap? Do their common goals and procedures reinforce each other or conflict?

3. In what institutional ways (through scheduling, a coordinating committee, handbook exchange, etc.) is each support service coordinated with the writing program?

4. Do all the faculty in the writing program and elsewhere in the institution know that all these services exist? What is the faculty attitude toward these services? Do they send their students to them, or use them themselves?

5. Who uses each support service? How many students and which faculty? What is the profile of students who use each service?

6. How is information about each service spread to students and faculty?

7. How are students placed in or referred to each support service?
8. What evidence is there that each service meets the goals it sets for itself or that the institution has set for it?

Personnel

1. What are the qualifications for working in each support service? How are the director and staff selected for each? What is the institutional status (faculty, graduate student, full-time, part-time, etc.) of support service personnel? How are they compensated for their work? How is their work evaluated?
2. How are support service personnel trained?
3. What evidence is there of professional development among support service personnel?
4. What opportunities are there for professional development of support service personnel? How does the institution reward support service personnel for improving the service and for developing *themselves* professionally?
5. What kind of relationship exists between the writing program faculty and support service personnel? How do support service personnel view the writing program faculty, and vice versa? Do writing program faculty and support service personnel meet regularly to discuss students involved in both programs? Is there an active exchange of information on curricular and administrative matters?
6. What role do support service personnel play in formulating writing program policy? What role do writing program faculty play in formulating the policies and procedures of support services?

Administration

1. Do students get credit for work completed in support services? If so, how is credit determined?
2. How is each support service funded? Who decides how the money is spent? How is it currently being spent?
3. Does each support service keep records of expenditures, contact hours, enrollment, student work completed, services rendered, credit earned, etc?
4. Does each support service follow up on students who have used its services?
5. Is there continuing self-evaluation of each service by its staff? Is each service regularly evaluated by someone not actively involved in its work?
6. What coordination exists between the support services, the writing program, and the institution's admissions and recruitment officers?
7. What are the short- and long-range goals of each support service? How does each plan to reach these goals?

A common-sense approach to administration

David Rankin

***The Effective Administrator* by Donald E. Walker. Josey-Bass. San Francisco, 1979. 208 pp.**

In *The Effective Administrator*, Donald E. Walker, president of Southeastern Massachusetts University, argues for a "democratic, pluralistic" model for the university, and throughout the book he explores the implications of this model, a frankly political one, for administrative policies, procedures, and, especially, style. He contends that administrators who fully understand this model and carry out its imperatives will enjoy the moral authority that is indispensable to academic leadership.

Early in the book, Walker states what I take to be his animating concept: "At the heart of the university is the centrality of the individual. The belief that operates as a conscious and unconscious dynamic is that the individual celebrating his or her own intelligence through industry informed by moral vision will make the best contribution to the university and to the world. People are regarded as more important than procedures" (p. 23). Ultimately, he expresses succinctly what is implied on nearly every page: "There is tremendous wit and wisdom in a university. The job of administration is to call it forth and put it to work" (p. 138). Walker's first audience is college presidents and deans. But writing program administrators too might learn something of value from the general principles of good administration Walker espouses.

Impersonality and pragmatism. During the last 20 years, Walker has held a variety of administrative posts, including the presidency of Idaho State University, so he is able to illustrate his ideas with many examples and anecdotes. He also enlivens the text with pithy remarks (usually attributed to "someone who once said") intended to carry the force of folk wisdom. The result is a style that gives the impression of a real person speaking about matters that have more than theoretical significance for him. Indeed, he disavows an intention to write either a theoretical treatise or a handbook on administration, but rather hopes his book will "bridge the gap" between the two poles: he sets out to produce a practical book "informed by a point of view." Individual readers are best left to judge whether Mr. Walker has attained his objective. His many examples of how real problems were resolved demonstrate the efficacy of his point of view and, correspondingly, the failure of authoritarian methods. To this extent, the book is also something of a polemic, but a polemic sufficiently muted by the rhetoric of common sense to retain the attention, if not to secure the assent, of people with a competing philosophical bias.

Walker views the university as an organism with powers of self-stabilization

that tend to produce a state of health. For people who view phenomena characteristic of a university as evidence of pathology, Walker's metaphor will seem at best misguided, at worst mischievous. He would reply that many of these phenomena—for instance, reflexive contentiousness, the (alleged) impracticality of the faculty, obsession with apparent trivia—are comprehensible if one adopts his notion of the university as a political institution reflecting not only specific realities of its own but also the more general realities of all of its political subdivisions. The struggles for power and scarce resources that inevitably go on in nation states, and in federal units within nation states, are duplicated in the academy, where a concentration of highly intelligent, creative, articulate people lends special intensity to a process of conflict that is at once natural and healthy. Within this frame, Walker assigns to administrators the role of problem solver and facilitator, as distinct from the role of lawgiver, authoritarian leader, or moral conscience. He would appear also to recommend a scrupulous impersonality and a dogged pragmatism as the chief strategies of correct administrative conduct: in short, statesmanship.

Walker's obvious passion for the university, then, finds expression in a dispassionate style of leadership. Repeatedly, he warns administrators against emotional involvement in campus disputes and, emphatically, against using punitive measures even when transgressions appear to have been committed. *He* puts his faith in procedures that carry collective authority because they *have* been established *by the community*. Nowhere is his emphasis on the *polls* stronger than when he is speaking of the need for rational mechanisms that take into account the interests of all the constituencies within the university.

The art of sharing authority. The psychological principles of administration that Walker propounds are applicable to the management of writing programs. The WPA functions, however, in circumstances that are somewhat different from those of a dean or president. Both the scope and power of the WPA's authority are limited in comparison to that of line administrators. One of Walker's key points, however, is that the good administrator will not rely on legal authority but rather will work from a base of authority that has been earned, that derives ultimately from the consent of the governed, and that must constantly be renewed in the dynamic of the democratic process. It is always a shared authority.

In rejecting the pyramid model of administration, Walker in fact comes close to recommending for the university at large the management model that most successful WPAs use, whether or not they are consciously guided by a theory of administration. Nowadays, one rarely encounters, even in very large programs, the autocratic WPA who is determined to force compliance with a lock-step syllabus. Even in large, highly centralized programs, which of necessity seek some degree of uniformity in a course plan, instructional discretion is likely to be permitted. *Laissez faire* may not have arrived, but *Czarism* has certainly been discarded.

Walker ends his book with a list of "axioms" to summarize his message. Unavoidably, such pronouncements sound banal, but they also typify his common-sense approach to administration. It might be useful to select a few of them and see how they apply to the job of the WPA.

The job of administration is to call forth talent—to help people work in effective and constructive ways. Health and vitality come from the bottom up and one

should take care not to stifle sources of creativity. Those closest to the problem often have the best solution. Consult them first.

I recall that when I worked as a TA for Francis Christensen 25 years ago, he followed the practice, unusual in those days, of holding with the writing staff what would now be called brain-storming sessions. He also encouraged junior instructors and TAs to share ideas with him individually. We knew that he was the expert, of course; most of us took his graduate courses in composition and rhetoric. But we also knew that he trusted us to learn valuable lessons from our own experience. Those lessons, he felt, *were useful* for everybody. I adopted Christensen's method of leadership in my own writing program and was constantly pleased by the results. As often as not, one teacher's problems proved to be problems that we all faced in one form or other. Equally as often, the collective ingenuity of the staff produced solutions that benefited the entire program. Ideas that looked good when hatched in isolation from classroom conditions (that is to say, in meetings of the composition committee) often failed to survive the test of reality, and were either rejected *or* modified.

An administrator works with the consent of the governed. The most reliable tools of the administrator are diplomacy and persuasion.

Even WPAs who work from a syllabus or detailed course plan are aware of the need to explain the program to the staff. The more persuasive the explanation, the greater the chances that instructors will try to make the plan work. Moreover, the WPA is often called upon to exercise diplomacy in resolving disputes between students and instructors, who constitute two levels of "the governed." Now that we have abandoned the absolutist notion that the instructor is automatically and always right, the WPA requires a high order of judgment and tact to adjudicate disputes over grades, fair treatment, and other issues that arise in the contemporary university. Wise WPAs rely upon well-defined procedures that are understood by all to exist for the sole purpose of ensuring academic justice for staff and students alike.

Of course, sound procedures do not always moderate the feelings that erupt when personalities collide or when the procedures themselves are seen by one or both parties to a dispute as favoring the other party. No handbook or axiom can guide a WPA faced with a person who insists he or she has been treated unfairly. In these cases, after diplomacy and persuasion have been tried, the WPA, like any other administrator, must render and hold to a decision and then live with the consequences. Walker is right in emphasizing administrative style, which equates roughly with rhetorical *ethos*, because procedures, after all, are merely mechanisms. They carry authority only when it is not possible "to tell the dancer from the dance."

We should be quick to specify, too, the kind of authority that finally distinguishes the WPA from central administrators: the authority that comes with the ability to demonstrate knowledge of one's subject. Administration, strictly speaking, has no subject matter. (All right, its processes are its subject matter.) WPAs must do more than show that they know how to lead. They must show others what they should know about composition, how to know it, and how to share that knowledge with others—the students.

Don't underestimate the strength of a team. It is true—all of us together are smarter than any one of us alone.

This is a corollary of the idea that administrators should "call forth talent." A writing staff is, of course, different from a college president's council or some other form of administrative network. Skill, knowledge, status, experience, and dedication are not distributed evenly among the members of a writing staff. Neither is the willingness to be led. While this may also be true of an "administrative team," no collection of line and staff deans, for instance, is likely to contain any TAs, nor, for that matter, any full professors of English who consider themselves expert in the teaching of composition, no matter how loudly they announce their distaste for the undertaking. Today, regular faculty, including senior people, are assuming a greater share of the teaching load in composition programs. For many of these professors, this development means a return to the kind of assignment they endured as beginning instructors and may be connected in their minds with the ominous decline in literature course enrollments. The WPA's "team" may thus be composed of TAs, part-time instructors, and people on all rungs of the professorial ladder. Together in one room at a staff meeting may be the naive and the jaded, and side by side may sit a full professor and a TA who have just come from a graduate seminar in which no hint of team play has ever been introduced. The TA may in fact be a better writing teacher than the full professor, but the WPA is well advised not to celebrate this fact if he wants cooperation from the regular staff.

In a situation where the staff is composed largely of TAs and directed by a senior person with a distinguished reputation in the field, the circumstances are not unlike those on an athletic team. The team members are learners as well as teachers, and they know it. The director acts as a sort of coach, perhaps in several capacities: as an assigner of position, as leader of workshops, as evaluator of performance, and often as instructor in graduate courses concerned with the teaching of composition and with rhetorical theory. His or her authority is established, and he or she is expected to use it. How the director uses it depends upon the design of the program, departmental policy, and, ultimately, personal style. In any case, the team analogy cannot be carried too far, for reasons too obvious to state. But the WPA who establishes a good system of internal communication for the program will discover that a constant flow of ideas and criticism results in practical suggestions that raise the level of instruction in writing courses.

It is hard to fault Walker's sensible approach to administration, *except* perhaps to regret that he did not emphasize the primacy of the instructional program. His democratic model would appear to assign equal importance to all the activities on a campus, since he makes no overt distinctions among constituencies. His brand of political realism may, of course, be seen to promote the health of the instructional program insofar as the morale of a steady and dynamic community would certainly be reflected in teaching, learning, *and* scholarship. It is perhaps to cavil, therefore, to hope for an explicit definition of the university that accords more closely with one's own. It is likely, too, that Walker assumes that he and his audience share an understanding too obvious to require statement: namely, that a university exists primarily to disseminate knowledge and to foster the growth of the mind.

In the end, one hesitates to say that this book belongs on a reading list for WPAs, though it certainly would be useful to one who aspired to a position in

central administration. Indeed, the WPA seeking information on program management is not likely to find much help anywhere in the literature of administration, in part because that literature is increasingly dominated by a systems approach only marginally relevant to writing programs. This is not to say that WPAs cannot profit from knowledge about current management theory and practice. It is rather to point out a need for specialized work in the field of writing program administration, work that addresses particular issues and problems connected with the job, which now, perhaps for the first time, is being accorded a distinct professional status. As more people share information with their colleagues, in journals like this one, we can hope for the development of a body of knowledge that, in time, will ease the pressure, traditionally felt by WPAs, to learn everything from scratch about the job while trying to do it, and, at the same time, manage their other duties in the classroom and library. The new importance of writing programs corresponds naturally with an upgrading of the position of WPA, and, just as naturally, we can look for the good people who are performing the function well to tell us what they are learning about how to do it.

Notes on contributors

Thomas Bonner, Jr., is associate professor and chair of English at Xavier University of Louisiana, where he coordinated the composition program from 1972 to 1975. His Ph.D. in English is from Tulane University. He has spoken at meetings of MLA, SCMLA, ADE, and CCCC on literature, composition, and administration. He is the author of *William Faulkner. The William B. Wisdom Collection*; his articles appear in *American Literary Realism*, *Bulletin of Bibliography*, and *Resources for American Literary Study* among others. At Xavier he also directs the Andrew W. Mellon Program in the Humanities.

Barbara Brothers chairs the English Department at Youngstown State University. Her Ph.D. in English is from Kent State University. She has published articles and reviews in *Boundary 2*, *Mosaic*, *ADE Bulletin*, *James Joyce Quarterly*, *Journal of Beckett Studies*, *Phi Kappa Phi Journal*, *Sean O'Casey Review*, and the *ACIS Newsletter*. She has read papers at NCTE and CCCC and has just been elected to the CEA nominating committee. She serves as vice-president and program chair of the CEAO and on the State Committee for Public Programs in the Humanities.

Robert Lyons teaches in the English Department at Queens College, CUNY. He was chair for composition at Queens, a founding member of the CUNY Association of Writing Supervisors (CAWS), and chair of the CUNY Task Force on Writing, the university committee that developed the CUNY Writing Assessment Test. In 1979, he was associate dean for academic affairs, CUNY. His *Autobiography: A Reader for Writers* was published in 1977 by Oxford University Press. His article, "The City University of New York Writing Assessment Test: A faculty-generated model" appeared in the fall, 1980, issue of *WPA*.

Richard Marrius directs the Expository Writing Program at Harvard. He is the author of two novels, a biography of Martin Luther, and a biography of Thomas More that will appear in 1981. He has for 20 years been one of the editors of the *Yale Edition of the Complete Works of Thomas More*. Before he went to Harvard in 1978, he was a professor of European history at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Ellen Nold directs the Communications Project of the School of Engineering at Stanford University, where she teaches engineering students to teach other engineering students to speak and write better. Her graduate work in literature at

Stanford was followed by several years of undisciplined study in linguistics, psychology, statistics, and research design. She has published empirical work on evaluation in *Research in the Teaching of English* as well as other articles on revision and computer-assisted instruction. Her current work is on the theory of the composing processes of adult writers. In addition, she is co-author of a book on technical writing to be published by John Wiley and Sons.

David Rankin is professor of English and university coordinator of composition at California State University, Dominguez Hills. He received his Ph.D. from the University of London. He has published a textbook on composition and several articles in professional journals. In California, he has been active on committees dealing with writing skills, testing, and joint programs with the University of California. He directed the South Basin Writing Project, which offers in-service training modeled on the Bay Area Writing Project, and he has conducted professional development seminars for college teachers. He is preparing a book on the rhetoric of George Orwell.

Announcements

Guest Editors

The following members of **WPA** have generously contributed their time and expertise as guest referees for Volume 4 of **WPA**, or have contributed in other ways this year to the editorial development of the journal: Harry Crosby, Boston University; Winifred Horner, University of Missouri; Robert Lyons, Queens College; Elaine Maimon, Beaver College; Donald McQuade, Queens College; Ann Raimes, Hunter College; Jennie Skerl, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute; and Mark Smith, Northern Michigan University. The Editor and Editorial Board of **WPA** are most grateful for their help.

Nominations for the WPA Board of Consultant-Evaluators

The **WPA** Executive Committee invites nominations for consultant-evaluators for **WPA's** Exxon-funded project in writing program evaluation.

Nominees should have at least three years experience in writing program administration, and have evidenced professional involvement at the regional or national level. Prior experience as a consultant or evaluator is desirable but not necessary. Nominees must be members of **WPA**. **WPA** members may nominate themselves or others.

Nominees must submit the following materials: a nominating letter, two letters of recommendation (one from outside the nominee's own institution), the names of two additional people who have knowledge of the nominee's professional capacity and administrative experience, and a curriculum vitae. Letters of recommendation should address the nominee's academic background, administrative ability and experience, and ability to work with people. **WPA** consultant-evaluators must be able to interview and evaluate, recognize and acknowledge strengths and weaknesses, and present findings in a well-organized, clearly written report. Tact, integrity, and intelligence are equally important in a well-qualified consultant-evaluator.

Nominees appointed to the **WPA** Board of Consultant-Evaluators must be able to attend a day-long training workshop at CCCC in Dallas, Texas, March 25, 1981. Completed application materials for nomination must be received by January 15, 1981. Address nominations to Winifred B. Horner, **WPA** VicePresident, 11 South Glenwood, Columbia, MO 65201.

WPA at MLA

The **WPA** session at the MLA convention in Houston will be Session No. 516, in Arbor 1 of the Hyatt Hotel. The topic will be "Selecting, Training, and Integrat-

ing Part-Time English Faculty," and panelists will be Wayne C. Booth, University of Chicago; Maxine Hairston, University of Texas; and Donald A. McQuade, Queens College, CUNY. The session will include a general membership meeting.

WPA at CCCC

The **WPA** special session at CCCC this year (Dallas, Texas, March 26-28, 1981) will continue the theme of **WPA's** session at the 1980 **MLA** convention: selecting, training, and integrating part-time faculty. Barbara Agonia, Clark Community College, will present a preliminary report of the CCCC committee on part-time faculty. Other panelists will be Richard Lloyd-Jones, University of Iowa, and Richard Marius, Harvard University. The panel moderator will be Winifred Horner, vice-president of **WPA**.

Writing across the curriculum

The National Endowment for the Humanities will sponsor a five-week institute in Writing Across the Curriculum at Beaver College, June 29 to July 31, 1981. Prospective participants must apply in teams of three: two college or university instructors from the same institution—one in English, one in another humanities discipline—and one instructor (in English, social studies, or foreign language) from a secondary institution in the same geographic area as the college or university. For further information and application write to: Professor Elaine P. Maimon, Beaver College, Glenside, PA 19038. Telephone: 215-884-3500, extension 320.

Summer peer tutoring institute

The Brooklyn College Summer Institute in Training Peer Tutors will be offered for a second time during summer, 1981. Institute seminars are based on the course described by Marcia Silver in "Training and Using Peer Tutors," *College English*, December, 1978; and by Kenneth A. Bruffee in "The Brooklyn Plan: Attaining Intellectual Growth through Peer-Group Tutoring," *Liberal Education*, December, 1978, and in *A Short Course in Writing*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Winthrop, 1980). Application forms for the 1981 institute, and for the institute's New York City regional internships, may be obtained by writing Marcia Silver, Project Administrator, Brooklyn College Peer-Tutor Training Institute, English Department, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, New York 11210. The institute is supported by a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.

In the spring issue

Writing across the curriculum

Toby Fulwiler, Elaine Maimon, Ann Raimes

The WPA guide to planning and organizing regional conferences

Margaret Furcron

Membership in the Council of Writing Program Administrators

Membership in the Council of Writing Program Administrators includes a subscription to *WPA*. The membership fee is \$10 a year in the United States and \$11.50 a year in other countries.*

To apply for membership, please fill out this form and return it with a check or money order payable to the Council of Writing Program Administrators. Send the form and fee to Joseph Comprone, Treasurer, WPA, English Department, University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky 40208.

Date _____

Name _____

Title _____

Institution _____

Address _____

Amount enclosed _____ \$10 _____ \$11.50

*Members who join during the period September 1 through January 15 will receive the fall, winter, and spring issues of the current year's volume. Members who join from January 15 through September 1 will receive the last issue of the current year (spring) and the first two issues of the next volume (fall and winter).

Change or revision of name and address. If the name or address printed on your *WPA* mailing label is incorrect or has changed, please print the complete, correct information below and send it to Kenneth A. Bruffee, Editor, *WPA*, English Department, Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, New York 11210.
