

WPA

Writing Program Administration

Journal of the Council of Writing Program Administrators
Volume 4, Number 3, Spring, 1981

Editor

Kenneth A. Bruffee, Brooklyn College, CUNY

Managing Editor

Joseph F. Trimmer, Ball State University

Editorial Board

Lynn Z. Bloom, College of William and Mary (1981-83)

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

Charles R. Cooper, University of California, San Diego (1981-83)

Maxine Hairston, University of Texas (1980-82)

John T. Harwood, Pennsylvania State University (1981-83)

Richard Marius, Harvard University (1980-82)

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

Nancy Sommers, University of Oklahoma (1979-81)

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. Manuscripts cannot be returned unless accompanied by a stamped, self-addressed envelope. 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 Joseph F. Trimmer, Managing Editor, *WPA*, English Department, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306.

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 S. 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

Executive Committee

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 P. Maimon, Beaver College (1980)

John Warnock, University of Wyoming, Laramie (1981)

New from Oxford

English Composition for Teachers and Students—

Writing with Power

Techniques for Mastering the Writing Process

PETER ELBOW, Evergreen State College. The author of the widely acclaimed *Writing Without Teachers* addresses himself to all those who wish to gain real power over words. Elbow first describes a variety of practical writing techniques that readers can choose among depending on their temperament, writing task, and audience. He then develops from these examples an approach that balances the sometimes conflicting requirements for good writing: the intuitive skill of creating and the critical faculty of revising. Elbow concludes by exploring the relationship of the writer to his audience and how power in writing is related to the concepts of experience and voice. Specific procedures for obtaining good feedback on writing are outlined.

April 1981 356 pp. cloth \$15.95
paper (Galaxy Book 642) \$5.95

The Writing Room

A Resource Book for Teachers of English

HARVEY S. WIENER, La Guardia Community College, City University of New York. This practical guide to classroom instruction presents a variety of strategies for developing the skills of beginning writers. Wiener lays out a comprehensive program for the composition classroom, including suggestions for motivating students, for teaching basic rhetorical strategies and mastery of detail, and for understanding and implementing a competency testing program. This valuable resource also presents a sample syllabus and day plan, papers representing both successful and failed efforts after a term of basic instruction, and appendices which offer a variety of short writing assignments, sample tests, and an extensive bibliography.

February 1981 352 pp. paper \$7.95

The Writing Teacher's Sourcebook

Edited by GARY TATE, Texas Christian University, and EDWARD P.J. CORBETT, Ohio State University. This collection of thirty-two outstanding articles drawn from the major composition journals provides a comprehensive reference for both beginning and experienced teachers. Grouped into three categories—general concerns, theory, and practice—the anthology includes both classic pieces and recent pioneering work by nearly every major figure in the field. In addition, the editors have included concise listings of additional readings at the end of each group of articles and an annotated bibliography of 23 important books on writing and the teaching of writing.

March 1981 400 pp. paper \$9.95

Writing Prose

Techniques and Purposes

Fifth Edition

Edited by THOMAS S. KANE and LEONARD J. PETERS
1980 672 pp. paper \$7.95

Decisive Writing

An Improvement Program

L.P. DRISKILL and MARGARET SIMPSON
1978 294 pp. paper \$6.95

Writing About Science

Edited by MARY ELIZABETH BOWEN and JOSEPH A. MAZZEO
1979 352 pp. paper \$6.95

Style

Writing and Reading as the Discovery of Outlook

Second Edition

RICHARD M. EASTMAN
1978 432 pp. paper \$7.95

Prices and publication dates are subject to change.

Oxford University Press

200 Madison Avenue New York, New York 10016

WPA

Writing Program Administration

Volume 4, Number 3, Spring, 1981

Contents

President's message	7
Forum. Writing across the curriculum	
Writing in the arts and sciences: Getting started and gaining momentum <i>Elaine P. Maimon</i>	9
Writing across the curriculum at Michigan Tech <i>Toby Fulwiler</i>	15
Comment <i>Ann Raimes</i>	21
The <i>WPA</i> Guide to planning and organizing regional academic conferences <i>Margaret Furcron</i>	23
Notes on contributors	53
Announcements	54
Alphabetical index, <i>WPA</i> , Volumes 1-4	57
Selective subject index, <i>WPA</i> , Volumes 1-4	59
Bylaws, Council of Writing Program Administrators	61
Past members, WPA Executive Committee	63
Past members, WPA Editorial Board	63

WPA: Writing Program Administration
Volume 4, Number 3, 1981
Council of Writing Program Administrators

Copyright © 1981 by the Council of Writing Program Administrators

HOUGHTON MIFFLIN UPDATE:

From Experience to Expression: A College Rhetoric, Second Edition

Joseph Comprone, University of Louisville
About 528 pages • paper • Instructor's Manual
Just published

Comprone's exciting new edition systematically develops rhetorical and grammatical skills while emphasizing the composing process. Three sections focus sequentially on invention, arrangement, and style.

Guiding students from writing about personal experiences to more abstract writing situations, Comprone takes an inductive, functional approach that prompts student discovery of principles.

Many visual as well as verbal illustrations of rhetorical techniques promote student interest and understanding. Other special features include emphasis on sentence combining, a wealth of writing and thinking activities, integration of writing and reading skills throughout, and a new appendix on editing.

The Riverside Reader

Joseph F. Timmer, Ball State University
Maxine Hairston, University of Texas at Austin
519 pages • paper • Instructor's Manual
Just published

The Riverside Reader presents 50 traditional and contemporary essays chosen for their clarity, significance, and appeal to students. Arranged by standard modes of expository writing, the essays pointedly illustrate each mode. And they are manageable in length and reading level.

Clear, consistent apparatus keeps students constantly aware of the writing process. Stressing the relationship of active reading to effective writing throughout, the editors provide "Guidelines for Reading an Essay" and a section of stimulating essays on the reading and writing processes.

Writing assignments let students apply the specific principles they have learned for each rhetorical mode.

The Informed Writer

Charles Bazerman
Baruch College, City University of New York
360 pages • paper • Instructor's Manual
Just published

Bazerman's text prompts students to interact with what they read in order to produce writing that's both well informed and original. Teaching skills of reading, analyzing, and synthesizing source material, Bazerman shows students how to develop content and articulate their own thoughts in relation to the ideas of others.

A Contemporary Rhetoric Second Edition

Maxine Hairston, University of Texas at Austin
446 pages • cloth • Instructor's Manual • 1978

Hairston teaches students how to think and write logically in practical situations. Chapter exercises and assignments pertain to purpose, audience, and the best means of presentation, rather than to an abstract standard of correctness.

Reading Skills Handbook

Harvey S. Wiener, La Guardia Community College,
City University of New York
Charles Bazerman
Baruch College, City University of New York
304 pages • paper • Instructor's Manual • 1978

A handbook covering all aspects of the reading process plus study skills.

Also by Wiener and Bazerman

English Skills Handbook: Reading and Writing

343 pages • cloth • Instructor's Manual • 1977

Comprehensively covers both basic reading and basic writing skills for developmental English courses. Presentation throughout is simple, direct, and clear, avoiding complicated rules and highlighting important skills in readily accessible charts and boxes.

For adoption consideration, request examination copies from your regional Houghton Mifflin office.



Houghton Mifflin

Dallas, TX 75234 Geneva, IL 60134
Hopewell, NJ 08525 Palo Alto, CA 94304

President's Message

Dear Colleagues:

Last spring in this column I predicted that 1979-80 would prove to be the richest year so far in the history of WPA. I think it is fair to say that that prediction has come true. This year we have indeed moved into a new phase of action.

With funds from the Exxon Educational Foundation, WPA has begun on a small scale a successful consultation-evaluation program. This program has placed trained consultant-evaluators on ten campuses throughout the country to examine writing programs and to suggest improvements. WPA's Board of Consultant-Evaluators met at CCC in spring, 1980, to establish training and consultation-evaluation procedures. The board wrote a set of guidelines for its own use, and a "Guide for Self-Study" that WPAs and their colleagues can use to examine their own programs. That guide was published in the Winter issue of *WPA* (vol. 4, no. 2). Because of the high quality of the WPA consultant-evaluator training program, we have been invited to discuss our procedures with the National Endowment for the Humanities, which also provides consultation to college campuses.

The WPA consultant-evaluator program will continue in 1981. If your institution needs a consultant-evaluator for its writing program, write to me for an application.

The second major development for WPA this year has been its affiliation with the Association of American Colleges (AAC), a Washington-based organization of administrative officials at major colleges and universities in the country. Affiliation with AAC adds institutional weight to WPA's already well-developed authority in the field of program administration. WPA contributes to AAC, in turn, direct access to the professionalism and expertise of you, our members, in the educationally crucial area of writing program administration.

With these accomplishments attained, we look forward now to several years of consolidating our gains. I hope you will continue to feel, as I do, that WPA strengthens the position of writing program administrators on their campuses and in the profession at large. With that end in mind, let me appeal to you to send your dues for 1981 (\$10), if you have not already done so, to WPA Treasurer Joseph Comprone, English Department, University of Louisville, Louisville, KY 40208.

One last reminder. If you are attending CCC in Dallas this year, don't forget WPA's session, Friday, March 27, 1981. Our topic is the problems of part-time faculty and issues raised by the increased use of part-time instructors throughout our profession.

Harvey S. Wiener

Forum

Writing across the curriculum

I. Writing in all the arts and sciences: Getting started and gaining momentum

Elaine P. Maimon

Instructors inside and outside English departments will readily agree with those of us who administer writing programs that writing is an important part of the college curriculum. Such agreement, however, is light years away from establishing a program of writing in the total curriculum. That comfortable sense of initial assent frequently masks disagreements about fundamental definitions of the two essential words: writing and curriculum.

Many of our colleagues in other disciplines define writing narrowly in terms of its surface features. Some of them derive this reductive definition from memories of their own undergraduate days, when their composition teachers merely proof-read and graded finished essays. Since such papers were usually assigned on literary subjects, these future scientists, sociologists, and art critics frequently felt insecure about both subject matter and commas. Consequently, it is not surprising that our colleagues in disciplines other than English associate the teaching of writing with grammar and literature, two areas that most of them feel unqualified to teach. If we want them to incorporate more writing instruction in their classes, we must begin with a few reminders: writing is a mode of scholarship in all disciplines; all college instructors are responsible for teaching apprentices how scholars behave in their disciplines; and since writing is an essential form of discovery and communication in a discipline, instructors in all fields are, in that sense, teachers of composition.

Paradoxically, the department that may prove most difficult to convince of these points is the English department. As Pogo says, "We have met the enemy and they are us." Richard Fulkerson, who has studied the match between philosophies and practices in teaching composition, writes, "My research has convinced me that in many cases composition teachers either fail to have a consistent value theory or fail to let that philosophy shape pedagogy." The most important step for a WPA who wants to develop a program of writing in the total curriculum, therefore, is to work with the composition staff to formulate a consistent philosophy for teaching composition.

A consistent theoretical formulation of this kind requires many English teachers to break old mind-sets and to reflect seriously on unexamined prejudices about teaching composition. As readers of this journal know, the fact that many English instructors have never studied or even thought systematically about teaching composition is the dirty little secret of our profession. That absurd situation is chang-

ing, but WPAs must still work with English instructors, frequently senior colleagues, who were nurtured to expect that professional advancement meant no more 8:30 a.m. classes and no more teaching composition. Some of these English instructors view a request for consistent philosophical, pedagogic, and curricular thinking about teaching composition as though we had asked them to develop a theoretical perspective on teaching hop-scotch. They view composition as a subject without content, and their syllabi reflect this frustration. Either they have silently substituted a course in introduction to literature for the required composition course, or they have constructed a syllabus based on mechanics, conventions, and analysis of rhetorical patterns.

Neither syllabus serves well as the foundation of a cross-disciplinary writing program. If we want our colleagues in other departments to reinforce the process of writing in their courses, we must design a composition syllabus that introduces first-year students to these processes. Procedures and practice should be the content of a composition course. We should use class time to introduce and model strategies of invention, drafting, and rewriting. And at every stage we should teach students how to learn from their peers. Students need explicit teaching in the ways that scholars share—how we connect with each other and with the appropriate academic traditions—through collaborative learning.² Our reading list should be short but varied, introducing students to forms of writing in the social and natural sciences as well as in the humanities (including literature). Finally, the composition course should provide practice in the conventions of standard written English, as those conventions relate to students' own problems with composing.

This suggested emphasis on process in the composition course leads us from disagreements about definitions of writing to disagreements about the construction of a college curriculum. Clearly, I am suggesting that a program in writing across the curriculum works best when faculty members in all departments organize their courses to teach the scholarly processes in their fields. Undergraduates begin with the belief that different disciplines contain discrete bags of facts. Most instructors understand that all courses have the same subject matter—the world—and that different disciplines provide varying perspectives for exploring that common subject matter.

If the overall curriculum emphasizes process, then as writing program administrators we can suggest a reasonable division of labor among departments. The composition staff can introduce all students to a variety of procedures in writing and provide extensive practice in all stages of the writing process. Instructors in every department can make writing an inevitable part of every teaching and learning day by asking students to write before they speak, to write a one-paragraph summary of the lecture's main points, to write informal letters or reaction sheets that express responses to academic material, and to do other ungraded writing exercises. Scholars in every discipline can also use writing assignments of a more formal kind to teach students the complex forms of social behavior that are manifested in the rhetoric of each discipline. In practical terms, instructors can build stages of exploration, drafting, and revising into every extended writing project they assign, and they can employ the collaborative learning procedures that students have practiced in their composition classes.

When students have learned how to respond in helpful ways to their peers' preliminary work—that is, when they have learned to work collaboratively—then

a program of writing in the total curriculum becomes practical as well as desirable. As WPAs we can persuade our colleagues that, without overworking, they can structure courses that provide useful intervention in the students' processes of learning and composing. A program of writing in the total curriculum involves a more productive redirection of faculty energies, not a marshalling of new ones. Students do more writing, but instructors grade fewer papers, since the instructors working under this system assess only the finished product after commenting at least once on work in progress. Most of the preliminary commentary can be provided by peers.

I have suggested so far that instituting a program of writing in the total curriculum depends on developing a consistent philosophy of writing and its place in the curriculum. My own philosophy views writing as a variety of complex processes through which students can explore similarities and differences among the many perspectives on the world provided by courses in a college curriculum. A process approach to both writing and curriculum therefore implies collaborative learning in the largest possible sense. To engage faculty members at large in this necessary collaboration is a big but not impossible task. To get it under way, and to help sustain it, I offer the following suggestions.

1. Let colleagues inside and outside the English department know that composition studies is a scholarly field. Offer faculty research talks on the subject. Report on professional conferences. Make sure the library and bookstore are stocked with copies of important texts and journals. Organize brown-bag lunches for informal discussion of this material.

2. Make sure that the composition program is legitimately useful to instructors in other disciplines. Design the course to be cross-disciplinary and process-oriented.

3. Maintain an attitude of respect toward writing in all disciplines. Remember that flavor and flair may not be universally appropriate. Differences in aim and audience lead inevitably to differences in style. Read James Kinneavy's *A Theory of Discourse* (1971; reprinted by Norton, 1980) for a theoretical perspective that allows us to value styles beyond the belletristic.

4. Maintain an attitude of respect toward literary colleagues, even those who have enjoyed some of the perquisites entailed in abandoning composition to us. Literary scholars know more about rhetorical and linguistic analysis than they have ever thought applicable to composition teaching. We can learn a great deal from them.

5. Ask the dean or educational policy committee to set up a cross-disciplinary composition committee to study practices in teaching writing at your institution. That committee should include powerful people from other departments and the writing program administrator.

6. Once you have studied your own situation and have written a systematic report on writing practices and attitudes, bring in an outside consultant, even for one day. The consultant will say many of the things you have been saying. The difference will be that now some people will listen. Consultants are available through application to the Consultancy Grant Program of the National Endowment for the

Humanities (write for information to Janice Litwin, Program Officer, Consultant Grants, National Endowment for the Humanities, 806 Fifteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20506). Consultant-evaluators are also available through WPA (write to Professor Harvey S. Wiener, 309 Clearview Lane, Massapequa, New York 11758).³

7. A consultant can help with faculty-development procedures, including workshops. But you should first employ other subtle, informal means of teaching your colleagues about teaching writing. Teach your colleagues by asking them for advice. Ask to see copies of assignments they are using with their students so that you can explain procedures for these assignments in your composition courses. If you use an anthology of cross-disciplinary readings, distribute the table of contents to colleagues in all departments and ask for suggestions about teaching the selections from their disciplines. Adopt a departmentally selected grammar handbook and offer free copies to colleagues in other departments who are willing to list it on their syllabi as a required text.⁴

8. Many institutions have funds for faculty development. Apply for a portion of this money to conduct a writing workshop for faculty. At this point it is very important to invite an outside consultant to conduct the workshop. I have already alluded to the difficulties of prophets in their own countries. But choose your workshop leaders carefully. If possible, observe them in action at a professional meeting before issuing an invitation. Remember, their successes on your campus will be their own, but their failures will be yours. Remember also that outside agencies are becoming more and more unwilling to fund extensive faculty workshops unless your institution has already conducted a pilot project with inside funds.⁵

The benefits of a program of writing in the total curriculum extend well beyond improving the writing abilities of our students, although that outcome should not be overlooked. Albert Kitzhaber's study conducted at Dartmouth in the 1960s indicated that freshmen who were concluding one year of instruction in composition wrote more effectively than seniors. Why? The seniors had not written very much since their first-year composition course.⁶

What Kitzhaber's results indicate is that as writing program administrators we should provide opportunities for reinforcement and practice of writing skills throughout a student's total academic experience. By working toward this specific goal, which is clearly under our aegis, we are also cooperating with colleagues to reformulate the college curriculum in a fundamental way. Cross-disciplinary work on writing leads to other opportunities for intellectual sharing. Discussing writing as a process may lead to improved understanding of learning as a process. And a program of writing in the total curriculum may even help us to reestablish that disappearing social structure in the twentieth-century academy—a community of scholars.

Notes

¹Richard Fulkerson, "Philosophies of Composition," *College Composition and Communication*, 30 (December 1979), 347.

²See Kenneth A. Bruffee, *A Short Course in Writing*, 2nd edition, Cambridge: Winthrop, 1980, 103-34.

³See also "Writing Program Evaluation: An Outline for Self-Study," by the WPA Board of Consultant Evaluators, *WPA 4* (Winter 1980), 23-28.

⁴For further suggestions see Robert Lyons, "Faculty Development through Professional Collaboration," *WPA 4* (Winter 1980), 12-18.

⁵An additional source of help is the Beaver College Institute in Writing Across the Curriculum. See the announcement in this issue.

⁶Albert R. Kitzhaber, *Themes, Theories, and Therapy: the Teaching of Writing in College*, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

II. Writing across the Curriculum at Michigan Tech

Toby Fulwiler

How can teachers of writing influence the writing behavior of students no longer taking writing classes, or of students who refuse to take English classes seriously? No matter how carefully we design our freshman composition program, or how thoughtfully we teach advanced writing classes, the fact remains that most students do not treat writing classes with the same seriousness that we do. First-year students worry more about adapting to college and choosing majors than about improving their writing. Students with advanced standing often work hard in their major subject courses, but pay only momentary attention to the various support courses they are required to take. And many students at every level attach a stigma to all "English classes." They remember, often with great selectivity, spelling and grammar drills or foxy symbolic literary interpretations and, as a result, view all instruction in English with great suspicion.

One solution to this problem asks students to work on their writing skills in all disciplines and at all grade levels throughout the university curriculum. "Writing across the curriculum," to use James Britton's phrase, gives every teacher some responsibility for instruction in writing. Language instruction becomes the business of all teachers who use language. As a consequence, students cannot view English teachers alone as hung-up on good writing. Nor does it matter at what stage of development students begin to take writing more seriously or what major they select. At every turn of the university curriculum someone is paying serious attention to writing. In this way, students begin to recognize that writing is an interdisciplinary learning skill of great importance to everyone in the institution.

If this argument for "writing across the curriculum" is valid, as Dan Fader and James Britton have argued before me, the nature of the problem WPAs face changes from how to develop a better writing program within an English department to how to develop a writing program that is truly comprehensive and multidisciplinary. Since we posed this problem to our department at Michigan Technological University in 1977, we have developed one such program appropriate to the needs of a medium-sized institution with an enrollment of 7,500 students. We receive frequent inquiries about how this program actually works. What do we do to encourage colleagues in disciplines other than English to pay more attention to student writing? I answer this question here with a detailed description of our program.

Program components

Writing across the curriculum at Michigan Tech is based on principles that are second nature to most college writing teachers: 1. people learn to write by writing frequently; 2. writers need critical feedback to improve their writing; 3. writers need to understand the audience they write for; 4. writers should not be punished

for experimenting or taking risks; 5. writers need to distinguish between writing as heuristic and writing as communication. I might also add a final point: we do not believe there is "one best way" to teach writing—at least not at the present time. Based on these principles, we have created a writing program with the following integrated components:

A. *A required one-year course in freshman composition.* This course is the core of the writing instruction program. Students in most of the 50 sections study the composing process, learn to keep journals, practice peer-group critiquing, do library research projects, and work on critical reading skills. Section size averages 27; advanced placement and remedial sections are offered.

B. *Upper-division specialized writing courses.* These courses are offered both in the humanities department and in other disciplines. Examples include business writing, technical writing, creative writing, advanced expository writing, and literature and composition.

C. *Limited enrollment in humanities courses.* All classes offered by the humanities department are limited to 35 students to permit instructors to assign and evaluate student writing. Students in classes such as philosophy, music, art, and literature commonly keep journals, write several short papers, and respond in small groups to each other's writing. Writing is taught as both a communication process and a learning tool.

D. *Faculty writing workshops.* These workshops, conducted twice a year, expose Michigan Tech faculty from all disciplines to ways of using writing in their classrooms. During 1977 and 1978, three two-day, off-campus workshops were held for approximately 45 faculty members. In 1979, the workshops were lengthened to four days, and faculty members received a stipend of \$200 for attending (funds were provided from a grant by the General Motors Foundation). To date (August, 1980) 75 additional faculty members have attended the four-day workshops.

E. *Faculty seminars on writing.* We conduct these brief seminars periodically for departments in disciplines other than English. So far, we have provided this service for the departments of biology, business, mechanical engineering, metallurgy, physics and social sciences.

F. *A language skills laboratory.* This facility provides tutoring in reading and writing for the entire university community on both a drop-in and referral basis. It serves a wide range of student problems, from the freshman in need of remediation to the graduate student looking for help with audience analysis. Humanities faculty, in cooperation with faculty members in other disciplines, are currently developing discipline-specific lab materials to provide more pointed, individualized instruction.

Faculty workshops

Perhaps the most significant and unusual part of Michigan Tech's program is our interdisciplinary writing workshops. These workshops were developed to heighten faculty consciousness of writing and the usefulness of writing in teaching content-area classes. At these workshops we introduce professors inductively to

"the composing process" through exercises, discussions, and writing practice. We have found that such experiential learning, while it takes more time, makes a far stronger impact than if we simply told our colleagues what they ought to do to add more writing to their classes. Workshop participants try something out, examine collectively what they have tried, and only then consider implications for individual classrooms. Workshop leaders participate fully in every workshop exercise. Insights gained in these exercises result in powerful, personal commitment by participants to incorporate writing in their own classes once they return from the workshop. Following is a brief description of a four-day, writing-across-the-curriculum workshop.

I. Workshop objectives.

The workshop exposes faculty in all disciplines to new techniques for teaching communication skills. Improving student writing is the primary goal of the workshop. Strengthening student reading and speaking skills are important secondary goals. Faculty members who attend the workshop spend four days off campus studying, discussing, and participating in exercises designed to heighten their awareness of language use. During the workshop we attempt to accomplish the following specific objectives:

- a. To explore writing as a learning activity, different from reading, talking, and listening
- b. To discuss the principles of good writing appropriate to a university community in general and to each discipline in particular
- c. To learn strategies for incorporating writing regularly in classes in every discipline
- d. To create an atmosphere of common understanding among faculty about communications instruction in the university community
- e. To generate new ideas for improving the writing, reading, and speaking skills of university students

II. Workshop schedule.

First Day. Participants explore the complex nature of the writing process and discover, through discussion, that few simple solutions exist: the needs of a student who is poorly motivated to write well are quite different from the needs of a well-motivated student who doesn't understand how to use semicolons.

Session 1 (9:00–10:30 a.m.). "The writing crisis." Participants explore their own perceptions about student writing problems, discuss possible causes, and offer tentative solutions.

Session 2 (10:45–12:00 Noon). "The composing process." Participants engage in a condensed exercise to duplicate several steps in the composing process: invention, freewriting, revision, reader response, and peer critiquing. Teachers re-experience firsthand the role of students who are asked to write on command and whose writing is evaluated by another person.

Session 3 (1:00–2:30 p.m.). "The functions of writing." This is the only lecture session at the workshop. We explain the functions of writing as delineated by James Britton in *The Development of Writing Abilities 11–18* (NCTE, 1977). In particular we stress the importance of expressive writing,

where oneself is the audience, making the point that such writing, in journals, notebooks, or first drafts, is close to thinking, and therefore permits the writer to speculate, invent, and clarify, concretely, on paper. Expressive writing, according to Britton, is commonly ignored by teachers who do not understand its relationship to more public (transactional) writing. We point out that writing expressively is important both as an aid to thinking and learning and as the matrix from which finished public writing emerges. Teaching teachers in all disciplines to use writing as a "thinking tool" is one of the most important lessons of the workshop.

Session 4 (2:45-4:00 p.m.). "Writing workshop I." Participants begin serious work on a piece of writing—personal experience or academic—which they will continue to revise and rewrite for the duration of the workshop. Permanent writing response groups of five or six participants are formed. (This exercise is borrowed directly from the Summer Institutes of the National Writing Project.)

Second Day. Participants are asked to explore in depth some aspects of the composing process, building on ideas introduced the previous day.

Session 1. "Invention and discovery." Participants explore techniques for initiating a piece of writing. Writing is discussed as a problem-solving activity. The notion of heuristics is explained, and teachers create practice assignments requiring invention strategies pertinent to their particular disciplines.

Session 2. "Journal writing." All members of the workshop are required to keep journals for the duration of the workshop. On the first day, participants write in journals, but do not discuss their possible use. This workshop session formally introduces the journal as a powerful educational tool with applications in all disciplines. It is one way all teachers can assign expressive writing.

Session 3. "Writing for an audience." Participants investigate the role of a reader in the composing process. Exercises give teachers practice in varying their writing voice depending upon whom they are writing for. The importance of peer readers is discussed.

Session 4. "Writing workshop II." Teachers meet in small groups and read their writing to each other. Each group member receives a copy of the others' writing. Groups establish their own guidelines for discussion.

Third Day. Participants turn their attention from their own composing process to the problem of evaluating student papers. Materials for these exercises have been prepared in advance from papers submitted by workshop members.

Session 1. "Responding to student writing." Participants explore in small groups the strengths and weaknesses of sample student papers and are asked to generate a consensus about responses that would help the student writer improve his or her paper.

Session 2. "Sentence combining." Workshop members are introduced to simple techniques for improving the syntactic maturity of student writers. Ideas are explored for using such exercises in nonwriting classes.

Session 3. "Peer editing." Critique sheets serve as guides for par-

ticipants to practice commenting on student papers. This exercise asks participants to take the role of students who must make helpful editorial suggestions to each other.

Session 4. "Writing workshop III." Participants read and discuss the latest revisions of each other's writing.

Fourth Day. Participants explore classroom practices that might work in their particular disciplines. In addition, the notion of *reading* and *speaking* across the curriculum is introduced.

Session 1. "Writing in specific disciplines." Participants divide into related disciplinary groups and discuss problems peculiar to social-science writing, scientific and technical writing, and humanities writing, respectively. At the conclusion of this session the workshop as a whole explores differences and similarities in the writing tasks in each area.

Session 2. "Reading in every classroom." A guest workshop leader with expertise in reading discusses methods for encouraging critical reading skills among students. Participants practice exercises, including the CLOZE test, designed to enhance their awareness of what skillful reading requires.

Session 3. "Speech in every classroom." A guest leader from the speech department explores the nature of the classroom "oral environment." Short exercises encourage participants to look more closely at acts of public speech as well as the causes of speech anxiety.

Session 4. "Writing workshop IV." This is the last meeting of the workshop's writing practice groups. Participants read their finished products to each other and explore the kind of revision still needed to make each piece a publishable essay.

Session 5. "Conclusion and recommendations." This final meeting of the whole workshop explores possible writing-across-the-curriculum activities for the near future. Each participant is asked to make at least one concrete suggestion for using writing effectively in class.

A Tentative Evaluation

As of this writing, the Michigan Tech program has operated for three years. During this time, approximately 120 faculty members, including someone from nearly every discipline on campus, have taken part. While we consider this a substantial number, it is still only about one-third of the institution's 370-member faculty. Some departments have gained more than others. Humanities and social sciences teachers have been most active, followed by faculty members from mechanical and electrical engineering and metallurgy. In these departments substantial changes in particular courses have begun to occur. It is now common for students in these disciplines to keep journals, work in reader-response groups, and submit papers in multiple drafts.

Perhaps as a result of these changes, this year I have noticed less groaning when I assign journals to upper-division students. Chances are good now that these juniors and seniors have kept journals in the past and are keeping them now for other classes. When I talk about "writing as a process" in a sophomore-level American literature class, many students already know what I mean. When I suggest that students in a senior-level communications theory class "free write" to explore an idea, several students will invariably help me explain the value of the technique to the rest of the class.

These results suggest that we have already made substantial gains at Michigan Tech in changing faculty and student attitudes toward writing. But the results are difficult to measure. Students are now more likely to understand that writing is a process because they hear that message in courses other than English. More students now understand the complex nature of the writer-reader relationship, even if they do not achieve a perfect balance in every assignment. I know one senior who is still careless about punctuation when she writes a formal paper, but who has developed keen insights into herself and her major (electrical engineering) by writing regularly in her journal. Another student, a junior, who once thought writing was a drag, now recognizes that he needs extra help on every paper he is required to write and seeks it out. I would argue that in both cases motivation about writing has changed and, because of that, these students will become mature, accomplished writers, however long it takes. Attitude changes such as these may in fact be the major achievement of our program. We are currently attempting to collect data that might measure this result.

At a school the size of Michigan Tech, it will take some time for even the majority of our faculty to participate in the writing workshops. Nevertheless, word-of-mouth advertising for the workshops has been consistently strong. The university administration together with the department heads are on record as supporting the workshops, and the two-hundred-dollar stipend for workshop participants helps. Still, participation remains optional and voluntary—as it must for participants to be open to the experience. At larger schools, participation might be encouraged by offering workshops in institutional subdivisions, such as a college of arts and sciences or engineering, rather than offering them to the whole university. At smaller schools than Michigan Tech, where faculty are more likely to be acquainted, the program could influence an entire faculty in a relatively short period of time. In any school, influence is likely to spread more rapidly if the program is well supported financially. To gain this support, institutions might follow Michigan Tech's model of reaching out to local business and industry for funding. These resources will give workshop programs the incentive base they require.

Comment

Ann Raimes

I find it useful to have Toby Fulwiler's detailed description of the Michigan Tech program's aims and procedures. I find Elaine P. Maimon's article helpful, also, because it addresses some of the knotty problems that any WPA will face in trying to establish writing across the curriculum in an undergraduate program.

Maimon makes the excellent point, for example, that the first step is to work with one's own composition staff, not only to develop a philosophy of teaching composition, necessary in any case, but especially to develop a philosophy consistent with an interdisciplinary endeavor. That's vital. No writing-across-the-curriculum program can exist without it. Teachers of writing have to articulate why they are teaching writing, how writing is linked to learning, how people learn to improve writing, and what classroom methods are effective. Only then can they spread the word to others and develop a coherent approach college wide so that students will not be forced to jump from one philosophy to another—from free writing in one course to the *Harbrace College Handbook* in another. In addition, the very discussion of the issues elicits practical procedures for teaching composition and for training faculty. Maimon's article alerts us to problems that may arise in this effort and contains many practical suggestions for solving them.

Fulwiler's suggestions are equally practical but with a different emphasis. It is especially comforting to read about a well-thought-out program that engages faculty in a school substantially larger than Beaver College, where Maimon has established her program. In reading Fulwiler's essay, however, I did find myself asking a number of questions that I would ask of any program of this sort. For example, if an institution does not *require* upper-division, specialized writing courses, how many students actually take them? Is remediation encompassed within the one-year composition course, accomplished through tutoring, or offered in some other, lower-level course? More important, what sanctions does the institution apply to make writing across the curriculum succeed? This last question is one every WPA who is developing such a program should ask. Fulwiler says that humanities courses at Michigan Tech are limited to 35 to "permit" instructors to assign writing. This is admirable. But *do* instructors assign writing? *All* of them? Is giving writing assignments enforced in any way, or just recommended?

I raise these questions because they lead to what I think is the crucial issue in developing writing-across-the-curriculum programs, and in the whole attempt to place writing at the core of undergraduate education in every field. In establishing a program of this sort, how committed is the institution as a whole to the writing needs of the students? How much is the institution willing to risk to ensure that those needs are met?

This is clearly a political issue, one that every WPA must consider carefully, and

that inevitably, therefore, the Council of Writing Program Administrators must consider too. Where power resides in faculty decisions at the department level, as it does at most institutions, are there any rewards for faculty who participate fully in a college-wide program at the expense—inevitably—of fuller participation in professional work within their own discipline? Does service to the cause of writing—as we all know, a time-consuming and energy-consuming service—count in the battle for tenure and promotion?

I am aware that the issue I am raising here goes beyond the immediate concerns of these articles, and my point is not to criticize them for not dealing with it. My point is that once we have decided what we want to do in this area and how to go about doing it, our job is far from finished. The success of every practical suggestion for college-wide writing programs depends absolutely on how the question of rewards for good work in such curriculum-wide programs is faced and resolved.

**The *WPA* Guide
to Planning and Organizing
Regional Academic Conferences**

Margaret Furcron

Contents

Introduction	25
Phase I. First steps in planning and organization	26
Testing the waters	26
The first planning meeting	27
Who to invite	27
Deciding on purposes and goals	28
Coordinating the work	29
Phase II. Decisions that determine conference structure	30
Scope	30
How long should the conference last?	30
Food	31
Paying presenters	32
Funding	32
Conference-generated funds	32
Institutional funding	32
Outside funding	33
Format, date, and site	33
Mailings	34
Publicity	35
Phase III. Selecting conference content and planning the conference day	35
Session timing	36
Session format and content	36
Greetings	39
The conference-program leaflet	40

Phase IV. The conference day	41
Last minute arrangements	41
Staff selection	41
Registration	43
Socializing	44
Phase V. Evaluation and follow-up	44
Evaluation	44
Follow-up	45
Bibliography	46
Appendix A. Conference-planning calendar	47
Appendix B. Sample call for papers	49
Appendix C. Sample proposal data and rating sheet	50
Appendix D. Sample conference evaluation form	51

Editor's Note. In the spring of 1978, Margaret Furcron agreed to write a brief article for *WPA*, then called the *WPA Newsletter*, based on her experience organizing an annual regional conference at Rutgers-Newark. Her article appeared in Volume 2, Number 1 of the *Newsletter* (October, 1978) as "Eight Steps to Planning a Regional Conference." Since several colleagues around the country have found that brief treatment helpful, *WPA* was encouraged to ask Professor Furcron to revise and enlarge it. The following *Guide to Planning and Organizing Regional Academic Conferences*, *WPA's* answer to the energy crisis, is the result.

We are most grateful to Professor Furcron for taking time from her busy schedule to write this *Guide*. We also want to thank other experienced conference organizers who have offered comments and suggestions: Timothy Donovan, Northeastern University; Carol Edmead, Medgar Evers College; Nancy Lay, City College of New York; Elaine Maimon, Beaver College; and Blanche Skurnick, City College. We hope *WPA* members and others will find the *Guide* useful. The author and the editors of *WPA* welcome further comments, suggestions, additions, and corrections, which we will be glad to incorporate where appropriate in future editions.

Introduction

In the spring of 1976, my department mounted its first regional conference. We entitled it, "Lessons that Teach Reading and Composition in College." We have now held five of these conferences. They succeeded right from the start, bringing together about 200 people for one day each year to discuss their successes and failures in the difficult job of teaching composition and reading, and to learn from other teachers new and better ways to teach. During these five years, faculty from 48 different colleges have been on our program.

I do not know where I got the temerity even to consider such a project. When I started, I had never done anything like it before nor had any of my colleagues. But all of us had been to unprofitable conferences, and all of us had at least once thought, "couldn't I do a better job than that?" Innocent of any conference-planning expertise and ignorant of the fact that there is a body of professionals called "conference planners," we surged ahead. Our experience encourages me to say at once, to all of you who might hesitate, that you need not be timid. Planning and organizing a regional academic conference is a relatively simple, straightforward, commonsensical undertaking. Even the totally inexperienced can, with good clerical support and cooperation from colleagues, mount a successful conference. In our case, we met our goals and much more.

This said, then why write this *Guide*? If conference-planning skill is an inborn trait, why does anyone need instruction? Well, perhaps it's not quite so simple as I have made it sound. We made some mistakes, and we learned a good deal from our experience. I believe that others can profit from both our experience and our mistakes. Also, there are many different kinds of conferences and many different reasons for success and failure. A little knowledge is helpful to give you the sense of the options open to you as well as their practical implications. And knowledge can help you look ahead and plan the pitfalls out of your program.

For these reasons, I have looked into the conference-planning literature, surveyed my own experience and others', and compiled suggestions that seem most useful for anyone planning a regional academic conference a day or two in length with an expected attendance of 50 to 300 people.

There exists a good deal of literature on planning conferences, but most of it is directed mainly to the business community rather than to academics. Nevertheless, much of this material is relevant to our needs, useful, and provocative. I have selected a small bibliography of books on conference planning and annotated it for those who want to go more deeply into the subject or who want to plan a very large conference, with its concomitantly larger problems of site selection, travel and lodging arrangements, scheduling, and funding.

Although the Rutgers conferences have stressed practical pedagogy and have consisted primarily of demonstration lessons, this *Guide* is designed for planners of regional conferences in any academic field in the humanities, the sciences, and the social sciences. Our Rutgers experience has been mentioned in the *Guide* whenever it has general relevance.

It is possible that many of the recommendations made in this *Guide* will seem simplistic to some, and perhaps they are. But if so, then this very simplicity substantiates my primary message: *You can mount a successful regional academic conference, and you can do so on your first try.*

Phase I. First steps in planning and organization

The reasons for sponsoring an academic conference are innumerable. A regional conference might serve to

- improve teaching by introducing new ideas
- help train tutors and teaching assistants
- bring together faculty of regular and developmental programs
- bring together faculty in the same discipline from different colleges
- encourage young faculty to share their ideas and methods among themselves
- encourage experienced faculty to share their ideas and methods with younger colleagues as well as with each other
- introduce the latest research
- evaluate current practices or schools of thought
- introduce the work of an important person in the field

There are other kinds of reasons too, that are often the hidden (but nonetheless perfectly reasonable and legitimate) agenda of most conferences:

- to improve department morale
- to win points for your department or program with the dean or president
- to show off

And there are still other specifically local reasons for holding a conference. Every school, every region has its own needs. But central to what a conference can do to answer those needs is what, centrally, a conference does: it brings like-minded people together to learn from each other and, frankly, to have a good time doing it.

Let us assume that you are a program administrator, department chairperson, or professionally active member of some program or department, and that for some, or all, of the reasons listed above you are thinking about mounting a conference. The idea for the conference need not have originated with you. The initial suggestion for a conference may come from anywhere—a dean, a graduate student, or a faculty member just back from an especially exciting (or perhaps an especially unexciting) conference. Whatever the source of the idea, the person who takes it up—you—will be heavily involved from the outset. From the moment you take it up, the idea and the impetus for carrying it out is yours.

What should you do first?

Testing the waters. Probably the most practical first step to take is to sound out your colleagues informally. This is an important step, because it can give you strength when you get to the asking-for-money stage. It may cause you to revise the goals you dreamed up to start with. And it may discourage you, perhaps unnecessarily. In my own case, an important member of my department told me at this stage that I had had a really bad idea and I'd better forget it.

Hearing that advice, it would have been easy to forget it. In fact, I did postpone further consideration of mounting a conference, but I didn't forget. Other responses buoyed me and I moved ahead, cautiously but steadily. You should do likewise. If you get any positive reaction at all from any quarter, you should persevere. Opposition or indifference often comes from ignorance and inertia.

Hosting a conference may seem like an impossible task to someone who has never done it. The task of organizing such an affair may seem quite frightening. Perhaps this *Guide* will give you the background and direction—and some of the facts—you need to convince the skeptics at this stage.

The first planning meeting. If you have discovered some support in your department or program, you are ready for the next step: a planning meeting.

Right now is the time to consider a crucial question: do you want your conference to be sponsored by your institution alone and regional only in the sense that it draws participants from neighboring schools, or do you want your conference to be regional also in the sense that it is cosponsored by two or more colleges in the region? In answering this question you should keep in mind the many advantages of joint sponsorship, such as greater sources of funding and expertise, increased professional impact, and larger potential for communication among colleagues.

But keep in mind also the disadvantages of joint sponsorship, especially for a first venture. These include more complicated logistics, increased time required for planning and decision making, and increased opportunity for ego conflicts frequent in all cooperative activities. To a large extent these disadvantages can be circumvented by forming a consortium and agreeing in advance that although a series of conferences will be jointly sponsored, the primary responsibility for the planning, organization, and presentation of each will be rotated. This structure retains the advantages of single sponsorship and makes possible long-range planning that can enlarge your scope and enhance your goals.

Who to invite to the planning meeting. Whether or not you decide to involve other colleges in your conference plans, do not be casual in selecting people to invite to your first planning meeting. I have heard of some people not invited at this early stage who held permanent grudges. This animosity can be costly. It can be easily avoided if you make your decisions with a sophisticated and knowledgeable awareness of human feelings and the prevailing political facts at your institution. Invite everyone who might conceivably want to have a say in planning an event of considerable importance to the institution as a whole. At this point it is a mistake to invite only those who you think will be willing to work. Those who won't, or can't, work on the project will fade away after the preliminary arrangements have been made anyway, and you retain their good will by having welcomed their contributions. You will need the good will, too, of your clerical help. So if there is a person who will logically provide the main clerical support for a conference, he or she must also be invited to this early meeting. This invitation is more than a diplomatic one. Contributions during the early stages from your secretary may make the difference between practical plans and utterly impractical ones.

The same can be said for contributions from a person with budgetary authority. He or she can restrain high-flown planning and keep ideas and projections within the bounds of reason, given the institution's resources. On the other hand, at this first meeting it does not pay to be too reasonable. This is a time for brainstorming, for considering all kinds of wild possibilities. Money-minded people can be inhibiting if you do not warn them ahead of time about what you hope will occur by way of idea-generation at this early stage.

Include in your first planning meeting representatives from all levels of your department, including part-time faculty and teaching assistants. It is unlikely that a conference planned by only the senior members or only the junior members of a department is going to get the full involvement you will need for success. Of course, you will have to give some thought to the size of this initial planning group. A small group is most efficient in producing speedy results. But efficiency is a relative matter. In this first phase of planning you are probably better served by a large, representative group that will give you maximum exposure, maximum opportunity to develop enthusiasm, maximum number of people from which to select a working group, and maximum potential for generating ideas.

If your college has both "regular" academic departments and developmental departments or programs in your field, both should be involved in this meeting. Depending on what happens at the first and subsequent planning meetings, one or more of these units may opt out of further participation. But if they are included at this stage, they will leave without hard feelings, and may, if conditions change, return to the fold later. To try to include them at a later stage without having invited them at the start may be impossible. A conference on writing, for example, may eventually emphasize creative writing or remediation or advanced exposition or writing across the curriculum, and this emphasis will determine who will continue to support the conference actively and who will opt out. But from the beginning, all relevant faculty should be consulted. Planning a conference in this manner may even have an added value of helping to reunite factions that have developed within an institution. Whatever happens, you must be on the alert to prevent the widening of gaps that currently exist at most institutions that have a diversity of programs, goals, and administrative structures.

Be sure that you schedule the first planning meeting at a time when those you especially want to attend can make it. Urge them personally to come. If you can not personally invite every person you might like to have come, you may want to consider posting or distributing a flyer that issues a general invitation to everyone who is interested. This will cover your tracks in case there is someone you've forgotten, and may also uncover some valuable hidden talent.

Once you have assembled your Phase I planning group, your tasks are clear. Together with this group you must determine the purposes and goals of the conference, and decide who is going to do the work.

These tasks are clear but not at all easy. You may want to guide the group in the general direction of outcomes you have already decided upon. Or you may want to go into the meeting with an entirely open mind. That will depend on your situation and your style. But you should not be embarrassed to assert your own priorities if you have strong feelings regarding particular aspects of the plan. And if you decide not to try to guide the group, prepare yourself to accept fully the group's decisions. Querulous dissatisfaction resulting from disagreement or misunderstanding at this stage can dog the whole project and result in much wasted time and energy.

Deciding on purposes and goals. The list of possible reasons for holding a conference is, as we have seen, long and complex. Your institution, furthermore, may have some unique ones. Your first planning meeting should explore all of these reasons as fully and frankly as possible. To do the job right may in fact take more than one meeting. In the end, your group should choose several goals that can be

clearly stated and agreed upon, and which everyone can keep firmly in mind as the work goes on. These goals will affect every stage of your planning and work, and they will give a unity to your conference that will make attendance a richer experience than it can possibly be if the purpose of the conference is muddled or unclear. It is equally important to affirm potentially far-reaching goals as well as the more limited, immediate ones. For example, we expressed the goals we decided on for our conference in the following way:

- to provide conferees with immediately practical demonstrations of methodology based on experience and research
- to provide a friendly forum where young faculty members can share expertise with peers
- to bring together the personnel of regular and developmental programs at our own institution and throughout the region for exploration of common interests

Obviously these goals affected our conference format, our mailing list, and our choice of presenters, so we had to make our goals clear to ourselves early in the planning. We became aware also that we could make some important contributions to our own tutor- and teaching assistant-training program through the conference. Other advantages, such as improving our morale and our departmental image might accrue also.

Once again, don't rush this process of early planning. Part of your purpose at this time is to give a say to everyone who could possibly want it.

Coordinating the work. The next task is to decide who will coordinate the work. One person must be selected for this position. All the conference planners I have known, and all the professionals, agree that one person must have final authority on all matters from the dessert at lunch to inclusion of a particular person on the program. This kind of authority cannot be wielded by a committee. Though the coordinator will need help, he or she must be empowered to act alone when necessary.

The coordinator ideally will have certain particular attributes. He or she will have a good memory for details, will be able to delegate responsibility comfortably but with care, and will get along well with a secretary who has time to devote to the effort. Above all, he or she must be totally committed to the project and willing to expend whatever energy is necessary to make it work. This is not the job for someone marking time until retirement or just anyone who has a little extra time. The promise of "We'll all help you" is fine but cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear. Probably you, who have initiated the project, are the best choice for the job of coordinator, but if you do not fit the description given here in some important way, try to plan for that. If you are poor at details, for example, try to get the services of a secretary with a steel trap mind.

Secretarial help is also important for a good conference. Lack of it can ruin you. As with the coordinator, this is not a job for a group of people. Though several helpers may be needed, one person must have final say in directing the work.

The coordinator and the secretary are crucial elements, but they will need to work with a steering committee. This committee will be very busy at the outset helping the coordinator make decisions about format, scheduling, mailing, and

publicity. The committee will rest for some months while the coordinator and secretary implement these decisions. And then the committee will become very active again, deciding on the presenters, communicating with the presenters, and helping out on the actual day or days of the conference. Volunteers for these tasks can be useful, but there must be a core of people—the steering committee—that the coordinator can absolutely count on.

Sometimes diplomatic appointments to the steering committee are desirable. For example, if a developmental department or program has initiated the conference, at least one representative from the corresponding “regular” department should be on the steering committee. Or vice versa. Of course, cosponsoring institutions must also be represented, even if one college has primary responsibility.

In addition to reliability and energy, the prime virtues, the coordinator might also want to consider in selecting steering committee members such things as the number of contacts they provide for publicity, the number of friends they have in other colleges, and the probable flow of useful or exciting ideas. Remember that the impress of this committee on the final affair will be definitive.

You have now determined your goals and decided on your workers. You have made the most important decisions. But whether you reach your goals, and how you reach them, depends on what happens in Phase II. You have sketched your conference and gathered its architects. What you now need is to design and erect its inner structure.

Phase II. Decisions that determine conference structure

From this point on, many of the decisions you make will be irreversible, so each one needs plenty of discussion. Although the conference coordinator must keep bottom-line authority, he or she should resist the committee’s tendency to say “Whatever you want will be O.K.” Decisions will obviously be sounder if preceded by a thorough analysis of alternatives. Allow time for that analysis and the discussion it requires.

The first of these discussions may already have begun in Phase I. In any case they must begin in earnest now. They concern the interrelated areas of scope and financing. In most situations, it is probably best to decide first on the scope you want your conference to have ideally, and then decide on acceptable modifications if you have to scale down. With this flexibility, you are in a good position to dicker for funding and will impress the money men and women with how reasonable you are, a position that is always helpful in loosening the purse strings.

Scope. When we were at this stage of our deliberations at Rutgers, I received some excellent advice from a dean. “Think big,” he said. “Think of what you’re planning as being an important contribution to the profession.” For our modest department, this was particularly appropriate advice, but it is probably broadly applicable to all neophytes in conference planning. Don’t keep your sights too low if you want to have professional impact.

On the other hand, you must keep your operations manageable. You must begin, therefore, by considering three major cost factors: the length of the conference, food service, and honoraria for presenters.

How long should the conference last? In part, this is a question of how far par-

ticipants must travel. If many of your participants will have to travel several hours to get to the conference, a two-day program may be most practical. But you should not make the decision to run a two- (or more) day conference lightly. A second conference day will greatly increase your clerical chores. You will have to research local accommodations, restaurants, and perhaps even sightseeing or other entertainment. And you will have to transmit this information in your program mailing. Even one additional sheet of paper can make a hefty increase in your mailing costs. (It is this kind of detail—which can sometimes be crucially important—that you or your clerical assistant must have a head for.)

Of course you will not decide on a two-day format unless you can certainly fill that time. Examine your goals again, and the presenters you will probably preselect. If the conference will have a combination, for example, of research reports, demonstrations of methodology, and a key speaker, you can sensibly work out two full days with appropriate balance and changes of pace. But if you are interested in dealing with a single area of concern or a fairly limited topic—a single critical or methodological approach—then it is wise to avoid spreading yourself too thin. The more time you have to fill, the greater the importance of program variety.

In most cases, a one-day conference is probably the most practical and is certainly easier for a first venture. The prime ingredient for success is a rich program and this can come effortlessly with a one-day format. You need not worry about padding.

Food. Whatever length of conference you favor, you will have to decide whether or not to provide food. Almost certainly you will not want or need to be so spartan as not to provide coffee and pastry, at least in the morning. Pastries of good quality will insure you more good will than they would seem to warrant. And hell hath no fury like the Sanka or tea drinker at a conference where these commodities are not provided.

Should you provide lunch? Perhaps not if your institution has a reasonably good cafeteria or restaurant where space for your group can be reserved. That space is important because plenty of opportunity for social intercourse is essential to the success of any conference. Also, don’t underestimate the amount of bad feeling generated by lunch in a crowded and messy atmosphere. Remember that you want your participants to leave with good feelings about *every* part of the day.

If you provide lunch, check the cost carefully. This expenditure will be your biggest and you may decide that so much money for an amenity is not worth it. At Rutgers we decided it was worth it, and participants’ comments have supported this view. However, our registration fee does not cover the cost and we will eventually have to rethink the matter. One conference we know of in New York City made no arrangements for the lunch hour because of the proximity of dozens of restaurants, but this lapse was so sharply criticized by participants that the next year they introduced a veritable party at midday. Experienced planners know these things are important.

Wine and cheese at the end of the day is an attractive feature and is a possible alternative to a free lunch. It is especially desirable at the end of the first day if your conference continues. Some equivalent social occasion is desirable at the end of the second day also, but is probably less important than at the end of the first, if you must choose.

Paying presenters. Some conferences pay an honorarium to everyone who presents. This seems entirely unnecessary. You will probably want to waive the registration fee for presenters, and perhaps provide parking, but some successful conferences do not even do that. However, you will almost certainly have to pay a featured speaker, and a presenter coming a long distance might reasonably expect some contribution towards his or her expenses. Whom to pay and whom not to pay may become a touchy question, so be sure there is a rationale behind your decision.

Funding. Before you start searching for sources of funding, try to get an approximation of your expenses for your most elaborate possible plan, and for your alternatives. Don't forget that you may be billed by maintenance, cafeteria and audio-visual workers. If your conference is on a weekend, buildings may have to be opened, secured, and insured, and pay will be double time. You can plan to avoid some of these costs. Know the possibilities. Decide exactly what, if anything, you want to give the participants: paper and pencil? duplicated materials? free parking? Estimate the amount of paid help you will need for the day, allowing for more than you think. Investigate the cost of a printed registration form and program. Be clear about the cost of postage and make a stab at estimating the size of your mailing list even though you have not yet made that up. Remember that you will probably need at least two mailings and maybe even three.

With some cost estimates drafted, you are now ready to search for money.

Conference-generated funds. My own experience with conference going and giving has convinced me that while a low registration fee or free admission will not increase your attendance, a very high fee will cut it and/or tend to limit it to schools with large faculty-development budgets. The same dean who advised me to think big advised me to charge a high fee on grounds that something you get for little or nothing is undervalued. We thought he had a point and so we did set a fee, but not as high as he wanted. If you do decide on a fee, you might also decide for whom it will be waived or reduced: your own faculty? presenters? students? undergraduates? (One conference committee waived the fee for "students," thinking of undergraduates, and realized to their sorrow that "students" also means doctoral candidates, a large part of their attendance.) Whatever fee you set, it is important that you not depend on it to cover all your expenses. It may do so, but you need the assurance of support to make up any deficit. In your first year this is particularly important as you cannot predict the size of your attendance. You do not want to have to worry about money. Whatever worrying you do should be about quality. In our own case, we have broken even three out of five times (once we even made a small profit), but we continue to be grateful for the promise of support if needed.

Institutional funding. Your own school probably has several sources of money that you haven't thought of. You probably know whether or not your department or program has money you might get, but did you know that most deans, presidents, and provosts have discretionary funds? Also, faculty-development funds may be available for this kind of project. And if your school has a specially-funded developmental program, it is almost certain that the director has the wherewithal to support you, at least in part, if the conference will be useful to his or her faculty. At Rutgers, we were able to get a promise that the dean of the col-

lege and the director of the Educational Opportunity Fund Program would together make up any deficit we might incur.

Outside funding. If you cannot get such assurances internally, or if you need more money than your college can provide, look into outside sources. Local businesses are often glad to build goodwill by contributing to a college program. Your college's administrator in charge of development can surely give you the names of some likely prospects. A few foundations will support conferences. However, an informal survey of 25 foundations found only one that was willing to contribute.

Conference format, date, and site. You must begin now to decide how you want to shape the conference day or days because your first mailing will be a call for participation. Of course, you may have decided not to issue a call, but to select and invite presenters on the basis of what you know about who is knowledgeable, interesting, and up-to-date in the field. In either case, you and your committee will have to be clear about what you are looking for. The decisions we made at this stage were: not to have a keynote speaker; not to have a theme (we couldn't think of one); to concentrate on demonstration lessons exclusively; and to try to get a well-known person in the field to participate as a teacher.

These decisions proved suitable for our circumstances, but of course there are many other possibilities. Except for the decision not to have a speaker, we have not adhered consistently to any of these decisions. Our success in getting Mina Shaughnessy to participate the first year (demonstrating videotapes that had been developed at the Instructional Resource Center of the City University of New York) was one of our smarter moves. Her name on the program was a convincing harbinger of quality, and we all felt that her presence greatly increased the respectability of our developmental department as seen by our own college administration and by others outside the school. Not many individuals in the field can achieve these ends for you and make a valuable presentation too, but searching for such a person may be well worth your time.

Other smaller decisions will have to do with the length of presentations and the date of the conference. As to the former, we finally settled on seventy minutes, but planned to allow some presenters to run over, accommodating this overrun into the time allotted for lunch.

The decision on a date is somewhat more complicated. First you must decide on time of year. Remember that before the conference date you must have a call for papers, a response to that call, selection of the program, notification of presenters, printing of conference program leaflets, and registration mailing with time for return. Holidays will intervene. The whole sequence may take four to six months. (See Appendix A.) We decided initially on a spring conference and have been satisfied with that. It avoids the difficulty of communicating with faculty during the summer. In narrowing the time down to the month and the final day, you will need to consider vacation times of the schools in your region, other possibly conflicting conferences, probability of good weather, whether weekday or weekend, and availability of space.

These last questions, day of the week and space, are related to the site you select. Your own institution seems somehow most suitable as a place for a regional con-

ference, unless there is some special reason to avoid using it, and it is certain to be much cheaper than a hotel or conference center, even on a weekend. However, there is no reason to rule out a nonacademic atmosphere, especially if using your campus facilities would mean crowding, dispersion, or some other unpleasantness.

At your own college, get your room requests in early. You would be surprised at the uses colleges find for facilities you might think you would have free run of on weekends. Once we found that mass testing had been scheduled two years in advance for a weekend we wanted, and another year we discovered that the Girl Scouts were giving a party in the college cafeteria. Also, try to get rooms that are clustered in one area, not spread all over campus.

Mallings. By now you should be ready for your first mailing: the call for papers. Again, you may have decided to omit this step and invite those you want, but for most purposes and for maximum participation, a call for papers makes sense. It will not keep you from exerting tight control over quality. Selection remains in your hands and even with a call for papers your program can still be partly, even mostly, made up of preselected presenters.

Spread your net wide. Ask everyone you know for names for your list. Very likely there are schools within your region that you have never heard of. In our own case we were rather surprised to find 151 relevant programs in our region. Get names of chairpersons or directors of programs. Mailing to both regular departments and developmental departments is good policy, whatever your decision was about including both levels. Each may have something to contribute to, and learn from, the other. Since trying to bring the two areas closer was one of our goals at Rutgers, we were careful to make sure our mailing list reflected this. Effecting the exchange of ideas between college and high school instructors may be something you want to do and this also requires research for names and functions. For example, some school systems have a person who coordinates activities between high schools and colleges. This person, rather than a department chairperson, may be your best contact.

The flyer you send out calling for papers should be as explicit as you can make it. If it is not explicit, you will waste much time responding to calls for information. Be sure to put a name and telephone number on the flyer, but if your wording is adequate there will be few telephone calls. To save yourself time, ask that submissions include a title and blurb suitable for the program leaflet. Set a word- or page-limit. (See Appendix B.) Pay attention, too, to the looks of the piece. It should reflect the quality you intend your conference to have. You may not be able to afford printing but you will surely be able to locate a typewriter with an attractive typeface and a typist who cares about the looks of his or her product. Do not leave the proofreading or inspection of the first copies to come off the machine to anyone not obsessively committed to setting the perfect tone for your conference. Don't underestimate the importance of these kinds of details.

With this mailing, we included a "Dear Colleague" letter that asks the recipient to personally urge the participation of his or her faculty. This goes, with several flyers, to chairpersons and directors. Other mailings are single flyers. Many include personal notes wherever we have contacts. In our first year we mailed about 300. The mailing went out in October and we set a deadline just before Christmas. By prearrangement, we repeated the mailing in December, extending the deadline

until the end of January. This seemed to work well. We abandoned the second mailing eventually, but at first it helped to keep us in people's minds and was good publicity, better than the advertisements you will probably have to take out if you decide not to issue a call for papers. Typing addresses on labels with carbons, or on sheets that can be photocopied, greatly reduces clerical time.

At this point, you can make arrangements with your guest speaker, if any, and with other participants you are inviting, though you may not want these to be final until you have a better idea of the conference day schedule after seeing the proposals. Whenever you do make these arrangements, keep in mind the desirability of getting agreements in writing. A visitor to a recent conference was startled to find her name on the program for presenting a paper, the result of what she thought was a vague and noncommittal telephone conversation some months earlier.

Publicity. You should also be making decisions now about publicity. If you can afford it, you may want to advertise a call for papers in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Many professional journals also accept notices gratis. Spreading the word nationally this way may entice effective and knowledgeable people outside your region to enliven your conference, and in any case, is good public relations for your institution and your region. Also, try to get your flyers distributed at any other conferences that may be occurring during the year. Publicity at any time may increase the number of proposals submitted, though probably you will want to make your biggest push around the time of your registration mailing. At that time, enlist your college's public relations office and any connections you may have. Prepare some provocative press releases. Use photographs if you can. Above all, talk a lot, with friends, with colleagues—with anyone who'll listen and might be interested.

Phase III. Selecting conference content and planning the conference day

By this time you are probably wondering why you ever got into this. You are worried that you will receive only idiotic proposals and that on the conference day no one will come. Hold on. You are on the verge of one of the most satisfying parts of the whole conference-planning process: selecting the program. Proposals will come in, though much more slowly than you would like. Also, some of the worst will be among the first, for some reason. Do not despair. Allow enough leeway so that you can consider a few late ones.

First, distribute copies of the proposals to your committee as far in advance of your proposal-evaluation meeting as possible, but not long enough so content will be forgotten. We have always found it best to read all the proposals at one time, or within a few days, so that our evaluations will be consistent and we can get a feel for the whole program. You will need at least one long meeting, with your secretary present. It is especially important from now on that he or she be privy to all your plans. For convenience, attach a data and rating sheet to each proposal. To cut down on later paperwork and make post-selection tasks easier, this form should include space both for evaluation notes and for the information you will need to get from the participant later if he or she is selected. (See Appendix C.)

The group must make a number of decisions in addition to selection. A workable approach is first to review the ratings on each proposal and divide them into four categories: *yes plus*, *yes*, *maybe*, and *no*. In this step, do not think of anything but quality. Then, consider the following questions:

- How many sessions will there be and how long will each session run?
- How will time be distributed among plenary sessions (if any), paper reading sessions, panels, demonstrations, and workshops?
- Will there be a welcoming session with "greetings" at the beginning of the conference, and if so, by whom, and for what purpose?
- What impression do you want your convention program leaflet to give?

Your decisions about which presentations to choose will be affected to one degree or another by your answers to these questions. Even "greetings" and the conference-program leaflet affect your overall sense of the conference's tone, and thus the choice and "mix" of presentations. And vice versa. That is, although you will certainly have given some thought to these questions earlier, you will not be able to give them final answers until you have examined the proposals submitted to you in relation to the list of presenters whom you have invited and who have accepted your invitation.

Session timing. The question of how many sessions to have is a difficult one to settle before you have any idea of attendance. First you must decide on the number sequentially. Use your own experience at conferences as a guide here. Don't try to cram too many sessions into the day. After much debate, we settled on three session times during a day, beginning at 8:30 a.m. and ending at 3:35 p.m. Though a few people each year have said they would have liked another session, most felt the number was good, especially since it allowed for a relaxed pace and plenty of socializing time, features that have been strongly praised.

Deciding the number of concurrent sessions is more difficult. Too many and your attendance at some may be zero. Too few and you sacrifice variety and lose some good presentations. Of course, the quality of the proposals will help you make this decision. If you have lots of high-quality work to choose from, you should probably move in the direction of more rather than fewer. A large number of sessions gives richness and excitement, and if you can rally a group of people to attend a sparsely attended session on demand, you need not worry. (This kind of last-minute logistics, incidentally, is one of the best reasons for selecting your site so that all rooms are nearby.) We started with five concurrent sessions and eventually increased to six. Our day now requires us to fill 18 sessions.

Session format and content. Decisions about how to present the content you have selected will certainly reflect your personality and circumstances as well as your goals, but it may be valuable at this time to ask yourself what effect you want to have on the participants. Do you want them to become actively involved during the day or to be passive recipients of information and ideas? My bias is toward the former, and I am certain that participant involvement can be achieved by careful planning no matter how scholarly or research-oriented you want your program to be. Professional conference planners tend to agree. One says

One of the superior and unique advantages of attending a con-

ference is the opportunity it presents for personal participation. The competent meeting planner will program opportunities for such participation, and will try to engage each person's mind and attention. If a conference is well planned, it can engage the attention of each attendee, and, through the spoken word and the use of visuals, involve him in a deeper learning experience than is possible through any other mass communication medium. (Finkel, *How to Plan Meetings Like a Professional*, p. 16.)

Perhaps it should give us pause to think that business executives talk about learning in this way. Many academics who give lip service to learning through participation are still prejudiced against it, feeling that it has some unsavory connection with schools of education and cannot lie in the same bed with scholarship. Whatever your own predispositions may be for or against learning through participation, you should consider the effect of participation on the value and importance of your conference. Before you select your program, decide whether you want your sessions to be all participatory (which means demonstration lessons, workshops, seminars, or any format that requires the audience to do something), all passive-receptive (which traditionally means an audience listening to people reading papers, with perhaps a brief time for questions), or a mix.

Do not leave the final arrangement to chance. You need balance in order to leave impressions that will, so to speak, lengthen the shelf-life of the conference. Of course, you made preliminary decisions on this score before you sent out the call for papers, but almost certainly you will have some variety to choose from once the papers come in. Despite the clear request in the Rutgers call to submit only demonstration lessons, we regularly get reports on research and teacher-training seminars, and we have included some of these in our programs to good effect.

In most situations, the most effective design provides a mix of passive-receptive sessions and participatory sessions. Probably the ideal way of achieving a mix is to structure participation into each session. Here are some ways to make passive-reception sessions more participatory:

1. Present a panel with speakers representing strongly opposing views. At the end, ask if there have been any changes of mind. Distribute cards to write the reasons down, collect, and read. Or form small groups to develop questions, collect, and read.
2. Present one speaker, followed by an interviewer, and then questions from the floor.
3. Ask participants to read a paper, samples of student work, or whatever, before the conference. (Note that this format has implications for the registration form and for clerical help.) Then, at the beginning of the session, form small groups to develop questions for discussion by the author(s). This format may actually provoke a good deal of audience participation if general discussion is allowed, and so needs a skillful chairperson.
4. Ask each presenter to prepare several provocative questions on his or her paper. Assign these questions to your colleagues planted in the audience, or have

the session chairperson ask them if there is a lull in questions from the floor.

5. Demonstrate a method of teaching with a group of unrehearsed students. This is risky, but often worth the risk and the effort.

Here are some ways to make participatory sessions more fully participatory:

1. Have the audience assume student roles for an actual lesson. These presentations must be carefully selected, since many lessons that work beautifully with students cannot work with a group of people who already know the answers. Many do work, though, and are also both stimulating and humbling for the conferees who take the role of students. In selecting such proposals, beware of those that require the conferees to do lengthy writing or lengthy reading. Five or ten minutes of either is plenty, and more than that is deadly.

2. Demonstrate collaborative learning with groups of participants. This method is adaptable to so many areas of instruction in every field that more than one session could profitably be devoted to it.

3. Link some lesson sessions to research reports presented earlier. Make sure this is clear in the program. Allow time for presenters to explain exactly how the pedagogy derives from the research, noting also if practical application required any deviation from theory.

4. Tie a clinic session to an immediately preceding research report. Using actual student work demonstrate how it illustrates the research and how the student could be helped.

5. Schedule two or three sequential sessions around one topic. Each could be independent but might provide (with careful explanation) the opportunity for a participant to explore a particular methodology, or theory, in some depth.

While participatory sessions, whether or not directly related to research and theory, can be a very effective learning experience, do not, under any circumstances, include them for their own sake. Nothing is more irritating than sessions where participants are forced into "buzz groups" or some other trendy structure for no apparent reason.

There are many possible formats for presentations and they will occur to you as you read proposals. Think creatively. Do not let the form in which you receive the proposals be the prime determinant of the form of the session. You must shape the session yourself, persuading contributors to present in the way that best suits the total program even if that way was not his or her original intention. Make certain you know exactly what your presenters will do in their sessions and that their timing is careful. Do not let a person whom you want on the program for his or her name intimidate you into accepting too vague a description of the session. Be diplomatic, but be firm.

Share the task of working out the procedural details with presenters. You may also want to share the job of writing rejection letters. You will create much good will if these letters are personal and thoughtful responses to the proposals.

If you have enough staff to provide a chairperson for each conference session, that person can notify the contributors assigned to his or her session that their pro-

posals have been accepted and can arrange with them to shape the presentation according to the planning committee's intentions. The session chairperson will also provide contributors with the names of the other people they will be sharing the session with, agree on the presentation title and description, inquire into the presenter's special needs (such as audio-visual equipment and seating arrangements).

By far, the best way to do all this is by telephone. (Look ahead to the possible cost of long distance phoning when you prepare your budget.) Not only does phoning save a great deal of clerical time, but it also establishes the personal, informal contact that seems to make conferences more satisfying for all concerned. Prepare thoroughly in advance for these phone calls. It is extremely helpful to have a data form at hand when you call. The one we use has already been mentioned (Appendix C). Write a program blurb for each presentation yourself before you call, or make necessary revisions in what was submitted. Ideally this should be done in committee to insure consistency of style. While it is courteous to allow presenters to write their own, they do not often write something you can use unedited. Ultimately, one editor must be responsible for the program-leaflet copy.

In your calls to presenters, ask for names of books they have written or would recommend to other teachers. Add to the list gathered from presenters any titles you are especially fond of, and group them all by publisher. Write or call each publisher, explain your conference, and request a few copies of each for display. Most publishers respond generously to a request of this kind. The display will add to the interest of the day, and you will have accumulated several hundred dollars worth of books.

If you have the luxury of a different chairperson for every session, you can probably delegate a lot of worry about the shape of the presentation, timing, and audio-visuals to that person. But most planning committees are too small for this, and each committee member or department member must contact several presenters. Some of your colleagues who dropped out along the way may be willing to rejoin you at this point, if you have been careful to keep them informed occasionally, formally or informally, about what has been going on.

Keep very close touch with the people working with you at this time. It is hard to do this without seeming to be a nag. But at the same time, as the conference day rolls near, the speed of the work tends to pick up, and you will want to be sure everything is being accomplished in phase with everything else. Here you're a little like a master chef preparing a complex banquet, trying to make sure that every dish is correctly prepared and done at exactly the moment it must be served. And as in cooking, there is always one dish that almost always goes wrong. There has probably never been a conference in history in which all the audio-visual equipment worked to perfection. Probably you should delegate one person to be responsible exclusively for audio-visual equipment in order to minimize blow-outs, foul-ups, and no-shows.

Greetings. Greeters and their remarks can profitably be selected for diplomatic reasons. For example, since one of our goals was to improve the relationship of our developmental department with the rest of the college, we invited the dean of the college, who is also a professor of English, to greet the conferees. Also, since another goal was to encourage professional growth, we made a point of mention-

ing the publications of the presenters, all of which were on display in an adjoining room. After the first year, it was gratifying to be able to mention the articles and books that were outgrowths of presentations at earlier conferences. Whatever the content of the greetings, they should be short.

If you have also decided to have a keynote speaker during the welcoming session, make sure that he or she will make a provocative and effective presentation. If your speaker has valuable material to offer but will not necessarily present it with flair, it is better to have that person speak at lunch. In other words, try to keep the atmosphere light and buoyant to start the day. All the presentations will be enhanced by this opener as a background. Of course, if your speaker at the start of the day is too provocative, you run the risk of upstaging your entire group of first-slot presenters. Considering the risks, a luncheon speaker may be best.

The conference-program leaflet. By now the decisions on your conference program have been made, rooms have been assigned, and copy for the program leaflet (including title and brief identifying blurb for each presentation, and the registration form) has been written, edited, and—if you are fortunate enough to be able to afford it—prepared for the printer.

Professional printing is very desirable. Like the appearance of your mailings, the appearance of your conference-program leaflet says more to more people about the quality and professional significance of your conference than practically anything else you do. If 50 people attend your conference, 150, and maybe a good many more, will see the program leaflets that conferees take home and show their colleagues and friends.

For the first two years of our conference we had a good, but uninspiring, mimeographed program. Then to everyone's surprise a dean offered some money for printing. We found then that there are ways to get high-quality appearance without paying the exorbitant costs of an entirely commercial job. Your art department may be able to help you with design and layout, but do not settle for a less-than-professional looking job. For ours, we exploited a friend and the result was impressive. Many people have commented on its quality and a number have told us that they came to the conference because they saw our program leaflet posted in their departmental office.

If your program leaflet is combined with your registration form—the most time-saving alternative—don't forget to order enough to distribute on the day of the conference.

Be sure to include in your program leaflet:

- a map and transportation directions
- the name and phone number of someone to call for information (probably you or your secretary)
- fees and exemptions or reductions, if any (we exempted members of our own college faculty and presenters, and reduced the fee for undergraduates)
- the name checks should be made out to
- home and office addresses of the registrant, with phone numbers
- an exhortation to preregister

We found that a conference title and a short (two- or three-sentence) statement

describing the purpose and content of the conference is useful, because it tends to focus conferees' attention on the particular issue at hand. If you use such a statement, think it out carefully and make sure that it accurately reflects the nature of the program and also indicates clearly the area of interest or level of student preparation (or both) that the conference concerns. Make a final check of the descriptions of individual sessions. Are they complete and direct enough to enable conferees to make choices?

Phase IV. The conference day

This section will focus mainly on a one-day conference, on the assumption that a conference of two or more days in most cases just multiplies the number of times tasks must be repeated, the energy and attention span you must bring to your work, and, possibly, the number of things that can go wrong.

After your final mailing, you may have little more to do for several weeks, or even months, but wait for returns. This is an anxious period. You will have allowed plenty of time for returns, taking any intervening holidays into account. Still, you will feel absolutely certain that your mailing date was too late, or too early, or that no one will want to come to your conference anyway. From the preregistration returns it will appear to you that you and your colleagues will be attending your conference alone. It may help you to know, though, that this level of response is typical. We have never had more than 20 percent of our attendance preregistered.

Last-minute arrangements. As the conference day approaches, you should be making last-minute arrangements. At this time you should

- Get the conference paraphernalia ready: pads, pencils, folders, name tags, and hand-outs. These amenities are extremely well received. Years later people are still using the folders we supplied at our first conference.
- Double check audio-visual arrangements and be sure you are supplied with extension cords, extra bulbs, and batteries. Do not count on your audio-visual service to think of these things. Check to see if the electrical outlets in rooms work and fit the plugs on the machines you'll be using.
- Line up help for the day before the conference to get pencils sharpened, furniture moved, and the book display set up.
- Keep your spirits up. Try to think of other things.
- Keep your clerical help calm and reassured (do not call your secretary up in the middle of the night for any reason).
- Select your staff for the day of the conference.

Staff selection. Even if you have little or no money to pay clerical staff to work on the conference day, do not despair. Almost certainly, undergraduates, graduate students, and tutors will volunteer if asked. They will enjoy the affair and learn from it, so you need not be embarrassed to ask them to work, even without pay. We found that the amount or existence of pay does not in the least affect the amount of responsibility they are willing and able to assume. They will serve you very well. The only point to take particular care about is to assign the crucial jobs to people who have worked with you before and whose reliability you know first

hand. Also, encourage them to ask questions if they have doubts about what they are supposed to be doing. Make sure you or one of your knowledgeable colleagues is within call all the time.

The ideal arrangement of staff is to have two people in charge and ultimately responsible, yourself and one other person who has been involved with planning and organizing the conference throughout the whole period of preparation. This second person, your co-captain so to speak, should have direct control of

- registration
- room assignments
- audio-visual machinery (unless you have assigned someone else exclusive responsibility for audio-visual equipment)
- miscellaneous equipment such as lecterns, pointers, chalk
- coffee and related matters
- luncheon arrangements

Assign a number of fleet-footed assistants to this person. Here is a sampling of the sorts of problems he or she may have to deal with:

- a presenter doesn't like his or her room and wants to be shown several alternatives
- an overhead projector's bulb burns out and the spare is in a drawer that's stuck
- a presenter needs something duplicated and the nearest photocopier is broken or locked up
- the coffee does not arrive
- you run out of change
- a conferee must use the locked elevator
- Maintenance has forgotten to clean one of the rooms you are using
- Buildings and Grounds has not unlocked one of the entrances to the conference center
- a session is overcrowded and must be moved
- a projection-screen mount is broken
- a presenter wants to get a friend in free
- one of your colleagues forgot to relay the information that an overhead projector is needed

Of course, careful preplanning can keep these kinds of small disasters to a minimum, but no matter how careful you have been, they will occur. Just one can ruin a presentation or change the attitude of your conferees from cheerful anticipation to why-did-I-bother-to-come exasperation. On the other hand, a flying squad of resourceful young people directed from one central location can take care of these matters before they become crises.

With your co-captain handling the concrete aspects of the conference, you are left free to make people feel at home. This is a very important aspect of mounting a successful conference. You become, finally, on the conference day, a sort of academic *maître d'*. You can feel calm and collected enough to do this well only if you are absolutely sure that behind you everything is going smoothly. Your job now is to

- greet presenters and conferees
- introduce presenters to their session chairpersons or faculty contact (and undergraduate aide, if any)
- greet and introduce special guests
- insure adequate attendance at every session
- soothe nervous and flustered presenters

In general, and in every way, play the role of the excellent host. To do this you too will require some helpers. Introducing presenters to their faculty contacts assumes, for example, that you will have someone to find and inform you when each presenter checks in. You will not want, or be able, to hang around the registration table, and your attention will inevitably be diverted.

Once you have met presenters, you will have to assume that a colleague in charge of that presenter's session will take over and serve as an excellent host in your place. You may have to call on especially mature undergraduate and graduate students for some of this work, if there are too few faculty to cover every presentation.

Here is a sampling of the sort of thing you may have to handle:

- two panelists need to find a room where they can do some last minute preparation in peace
- a dean has taken the most attractive of your special guests off into a corner
- two deans are talking to each other about the next week's faculty meeting
- a few conferees who are high school teachers are huddled together unhappily, apparently wondering if they belong here
- a session is so sparsely attended as to be embarrassing and volunteers must be sent into the breach

The last item above underscores the necessity for having a large group of helpers on hand. They can function in innumerable ways: giving directions, for example, pointing the way from the parking lot to the conference center, from building to building, and to the lavatories (never underestimate the capacity of conferees to get lost on a strange campus). Your staff can tour the rooms to check on attendance or report to you if mingling seems to be needed. We have found it useful to give staff members a name tag of a special vivid color so they will be easy to spot.

Registration. On the day before the conference you will have completed all the clerical preparations for registration and, if possible, set up the registration post. Try to place this near the coffee area and also near the room in which the initial convocation will be held. At the registration table, station knowledgeable, friendly people who know how to make change. Establish a line, clearly labeled, for preregistered conferees where their name tags are ready with the rest of the conference paraphernalia. Establish another clearly labeled line for on-site registration. The staff members attending this line should be prepared to receive money, and give receipts, as well as pass out conference materials. Think the process through as carefully as you can. A smooth registration operation is important to getting the day off to a good start.

Socializing. Coffeetime is important and should be long enough to be worthwhile. This is one of the times when fermentation occurs at a conference. The other times are, of course, lunch and the wine and cheese hour, if you plan to have one, at the end of the conference. We have two coffee periods, one mid-morning and the other mid-afternoon. It helps to have the coffee table set up in or near the room where books and other materials are displayed.

Our lunch hour has always been between 12:40 p.m. and 2:15 p.m.—an hour and a half. Without a speaker this may seem a bit long, but it has allowed us some flexibility in letting some of the second-slot morning sessions run overtime if need be, and still have time for presenters and conferees in those sessions to have a reasonably comfortable lunch. It has also given us time to make announcements, such as exhorting conferees to fill out the evaluation forms and issuing a call for papers for next year's conference.

One year we were able to serve coffee and dessert pastries in a lounge after a buffet lunch in the dining room, and this made a pleasant change of pace and allowed for still more mingling. Wine and cheese at the end of the day is a pleasant touch if you can afford it. You may want to ask someone to make some short summative remarks at this time, but they are not necessary. Most people are talked and listened out by then. What seems most important at the end is simply the chance to wind down after what will have been an exhilarating day.

Phase V. Evaluation and follow-up

Whether or not you plan ever to give a conference again, the end of the conference day is not yet the end of the conference for you. Those you depend on for help are going to want to know how it went, and in fact you are going to want to know how it went yourself. You are also likely to want to know what effects the conference has had on the professional lives of those who attended. And finally, you are going to want to make sure that everyone who contributed to planning and organizing the conference knows what a terrific job you think they did.

Evaluation. In one sense, you can count on your conference to evaluate itself. Comments from participants throughout the day are a good guide to how things are going. You probably won't hear negative ones no matter what is happening, but if you hear none or few of any kind, you are probably in trouble. You should be able to sense the mood, especially at the end of the day. Pleased participants will tend to want to linger and talk and this should make you happy, though exhausted. Especially gratifying will be remarks like "Next year..." and "I wish X could have been here."

You can depend, too, on the comments of the conference staff, which should have had at least one representative in each session. If you make it clear that your ego is not involved, you will get useful evaluations.

Unfortunately, these kinds of reports about the conference are not the sort to impress deans and other funding sources. They usually like something in the way of a report on attendance, moneys in and out, and some codification of participants' reactions. For the last, an evaluation form is helpful. For maximum response (and for quantification) design one that includes both check-offs and room for comments. Appendix D is a sample. It has no special virtues, but has

been serviceable. One or two valuable suggestions have always emerged. Though the form is placed in each registration packet, it has been our experience that participants will not fill it out unless exhorted to do so throughout the day. From lunchtime on, staff with smiles and extra copies should be strategically stationed.

No matter how much evaluation you accumulate on the day of the conference, you cannot, from that short view, determine how well you met your objectives. If you have subsequent conferences you can tell a great deal from increases in number and quality of proposals and the like. But even if you do not plan to repeat the affair, you should keep your eyes open for such events as publications resulting from presentations, presentations at other conferences by those who presented for the first time at yours, adoption by your faculty of methodology introduced at your conference, etc. It is not an exaggeration to say that a successful conference can make a palpable difference in your region in many ways.

Follow-up. Your work as host, and that of your committee, does not end with your last bite of cheese and sip of wine. Think first of thank-you letters to all those on your campus who were helpful: cafeteria workers, maintenance workers, audio-visual technicians, or whomever. Think next of thank-you letters to the presenters. This can be a lengthy chore. To do each letter properly you will need positive comments on the sessions from your staff representative and from the evaluation forms.

At some point in your planning you may have decided that you want a permanent record of the conference, either on tapes or in print. There are good reasons for this. If you have been successful, your program will have contained much that is potentially influential and worth retaining. We have attempted to record sessions but have not had adequate equipment to do so, especially since our format has always contained a great deal of audience participation. We have always had requests for tapes, both from participants who had missed sessions and those who wanted to share the session with colleagues. There is certainly a market for tapes, which you could sell at cost or even for a modest profit to help support future conferences.

If you plan to compile the proceedings you must decide whether you want to include every paper or make a selection of the best for possible publication. In either case, a great deal of clerical time will be needed for the project, plus reproduction costs. It is best not to promise anything you cannot be sure of producing. At one conference I attended, fifty cents was solicited to cover clerical costs for compiling the proceedings, but neither money nor proceedings was ever heard from again. Whatever your plan, try to get your presenters to put their session into writing in a publishable form either before the conference or immediately after. This will greatly reduce your editing chores, and will spare you a good deal of nagging later.

If you can include in the proceedings some material from conferees about how their teaching, ideas, critical approach, or whatever, changed or developed as a result of attending the conference, you will add considerable interest to the volume. Contributions of this sort can be called for at lunch on the day of the conference, with a follow-up request by mail. Another way of collecting postconference experiences is through your tutors and teaching assistants if you are using the conference as a training ground for them. We have made a regular and very successful practice of devoting several meetings of our tutorial staff to presenting the gist of selected sessions and discussing applications.

As a final gesture towards your participants, one which will define and underscore the community of professionals with common interests that your well-planned day has helped to forge, try to find the time and money to send each participant a list of everyone who attended. You will find that this list will provoke many professional exchanges you will learn of later. In time you and your committee will understand the full extent and value of your creativity. What Henry Adams said of teachers is true of conference organizers as well: "You can never tell where your influence stops."

Bibliography

Drain, Robert and Neil, Oakley, *Successful Conference and Convention Planning*. Canada: McGraw-Hill Ryerson, 1978.

An exhaustive guide to the large conference that covers all aspects: transportation, food, accommodations, printing, and publicity. Innumerable checklists.

Finkel, Coleman, *How to Plan Meetings Like a Professional*. Philadelphia: Sales Meeting Books, 1972.

Contains much practical advice, especially about the planning process and about the kinds of control the coordinator must exert on individual sessions. Also has a very useful section on the main causes of failure.

Finkel, Coleman, *Professional Guide to Successful Meetings*. Boston: Herman, 1976.

A useful, full, planner's checklist from "establishing objectives" to "acknowledgement of contributions." Directed towards business, but there is a good chapter on "General Interest" and valuable material on structuring individual sessions.

Kindler, Herbert, *Organizing the Technical Conference*. New York: Reinhold, 1960.

A thorough survey with especially useful sections on determining purposes and logistics for a jointly-sponsored conference. A timetable covering conference day minus 12 months to conference day plus four months.

Nadler, Leonard and Zeace, *The Conference Book*. Houston: Gulf, 1977.

Though less detailed than others in terms of step-by-step, day-by-day arrangements, this is probably the most useful since it deals with professional conferences of all kinds and not merely business conferences. A valuable feature is the detailed examples from the authors' own successful and unsuccessful experience.

Appendix A A conference-planning calendar

This model is for a spring conference (on or about April 15). If you adapt it for fall or winter, be sure to take fully into account the unreliability of academics during the summer months.

Also, this calendar is a model for a staff who cannot devote full time to this project. In the unlikely event that you or your secretary have nothing to do besides work on conference preparations, you can move quickly through some of these steps.

April and May (one year before the conference)

- Hold planning meetings to determine goals, scope, funding
- Decide who will do the work
- Decide the nature of the mailing list
- Begin compiling the mailing list on cards

Summer

- Continue mailing list compilation
- Order envelopes, paper, and labels needed for mailings
- Address envelopes

Note: It is possible to start these spring and summer activities after Labor Day, but if you possibly can, allow yourself more time. Brisk movement is usually not possible for an enterprise that will almost certainly be an extra in everyone's schedule.

September

- Determine conference date
- Reserve rooms
- Prepare a flyer calling for papers
- Complete mailing list compilation and typing of envelopes
- Investigate expenses and prepare tentative budget
- File funding applications to outside sources (if needed)
- Obtain financial assurances from within the institution

Note: The last three steps can be made in the previous spring if your planning permits. The more you can do then, the better.

October

- First week: first mailing, with a December 15 deadline for submission of proposals; make arrangements with invited participants

November

- Prepare for second mailing
- Reproduce proposals as they come in for use in selection

December

- First week: second mailing, with January 31 deadline

January

- Research food arrangements and audio-visual service; make commitments where possible

Reproduce proposals as they come in

Order supplies for the conference day: name tags, pads, pencils, folders

February

First week: distribute proposals to the steering committee

Second week: select proposals and plan the conference day; assign a staff member to each presenter; make contact with presenters

Third and fourth weeks: complete all arrangements with presenters; prepare and mail rejection letters; select rooms; prepare program leaflet copy and send copy to printer

Note: This timing assumes a printer who can promise delivery in two weeks. Caution might suggest an earlier submission date, but in planning for that, do not underestimate the length of time necessary for negotiations with presenters.

March

Second week: mail programs and registration forms

Third and fourth weeks: final arrangements for food, audio-visual, and any other services; make a complete check of necessary equipment, supplies, and furniture, recruit staff, arrange for moving furniture if necessary; check rooms for working electrical outlets

April

First and second weeks: prepare name tags as pre-registrations come in; request flowers and greenery from friends; prepare signs and labels as necessary; assemble registration packets

Second week: notify food service of probable number to be fed; secure enough change (and a box for it) for registration

Day before the conference: brief staff; move furniture; arrange book display; decorate reception area and display room with greenery; check lavatories and session rooms for cleanliness and necessary supplies; assemble all equipment (chalk, lecterns, extension cords, screens, etc.); check audio-visual arrangements; check arrangements made with campus police (parking, unlocking); mount signs and labels

CONFERENCE

The day after, or as soon as possible: assemble staff to review all evaluations, oral and written

As soon as possible: prepare list of participants and mail it out; place all these names in mailing list file; prepare thank-you letters to campus help and presenters and mail them; prepare financial statement; prepare full report for submission to funding sources and for the record; make decisions about compiling proceedings and initiate work decided on

May

Start planning the next conference

Appendix B Matrix for a Call-for-Papers advertisement or flyer

Conference Title
Affiliate Institution

On [date] the [institutions and relevant units] will sponsor a one-day conference on [topic]. Sessions at this conference will consist of [brief description of types of presentation: demonstrations, workshops, paper readings].

The conference organizers invite contributions to this conference program. Those who would like to participate in the conference please submit a proposal by [date]. Suggested areas are: [list of specific types of subject matter or topics].

Proposals should be designed for [length of time-slot or page length for papers]. Keep in mind that your audience is likely to consist of college faculty (and high school teachers, graduate students) in a variety of fields, both yours and those related to it. Assume an informed audience but not necessarily a narrowly specialized one. Be prepared for questions and discussion following the presentation.

Each proposal must include

- a title and brief description indicating the purpose of the presentation suitable for publishing in the conference program
- a complete description of the presentation as you will give it, or an abstract of not more than 500 words
- a list of audio-visual equipment you will need
- your name, address, and phone number (home and school)

A committee composed of faculty of the [institutions and units involved] will select proposals for presentation at the conference.

Send proposals to [conference coordinator, address]. If you need additional information please call [phone number].

Appendix C
Matrix for a proposal information sheet and evaluation form

Institution, conference title
Proposal information sheet and evaluation form

Information

Proposal submitted by:
 Proposal title:
 Proposal type:
 Institution:
 Department:
 Address and phones (home and office):
 Books recommended for display:
 Equipment and special needs (duplication, audio-visual, moveable chairs, lectern, blackboard, other):
 Time slot preferred: most inconvenient:
 Time slot assigned:

Evaluation

Circle: yes plus yes maybe no
 accepted rejected
 Comments:

Appendix D
Matrix for a conference-evaluation form.

Evaluation form
Conference title
Date

It would help us very much in gauging the success of this year's conference and in planning for next year if you would answer the following questions as fully as you can.

1. Affiliation (circle one): 4-year college 2-year college high school
 other (specify)
 What department?
 developmental remedial
2. Have you attended this conference before? No once more than once
 (how many times?)
3. Please rate the program as a whole for value and interest on a scale of 1 (low) to 5 (high):
 1 2 3 4 5
 Comments:
4. Please comment on the presentations you attended, identifying them by number or name:
5. Did you find the program adequate to your interests and needs?
 Comments:
6. Did you find the facilities and arrangements adequate?
 Comments:
7. We would appreciate any suggestions you care to offer for improving any aspect of the conference.

Notes on contributors

Toby Fulwiler is assistant head of the Humanities Department at Michigan Technological University, where he helped initiate "writing across the curriculum" in 1977, after attending a Rutgers NEH Summer Seminar on "Writing in the Learning of the Humanities." He has published articles in *College English*, *CCC*, and *Freshman English News*. He received a Ph.D. in English at the University of Wisconsin in 1973.

Margaret Furcron teaches basic writing at Rutgers University in Newark. Since 1973, she has also been director of the Learning Center, a peer tutoring program which she established. She was involved in developmental education as a teacher and administrator for almost 25 years at Brooklyn and Medgar Evers Colleges of the City University of New York before joining the Rutgers-Newark faculty. Since 1976, she has coordinated the annual Rutgers conference, "Lessons that Teach Composition in College," which she designed and initiated. She has also been a consultant in conference design for national and local conferences and has presented papers on teaching composition and on tutor training at NCTE, CCCC, and various other conventions. She has been a consultant to college English programs in Massachusetts, New Jersey, and North Carolina. From 1977 to 1980, she was a member of the Reading and Writing Advisory Committee of the New Jersey Council on Basic Skills and has just become a charter member of the regional writing council sponsored by the New Jersey Department of Higher Education.

Elaine P. Malmon is the associate dean for curriculum research and the director of the Cross-Disciplinary Writing Program, which she initiated, at Beaver College, Glenside, Pennsylvania. She has co-authored two composition textbooks, *Writing in the Arts and Sciences* (available in January, 1981) and *Readings in the Arts and Sciences*, both forthcoming from Winthrop. She is also the director of the NEH National Dissemination Program in Writing Across the Curriculum, which will sponsor two summer institutes, one in 1981 and another in 1982.

Ann Ralmes is an assistant professor of English and coordinator of the Developmental English Program at Hunter College, City University of New York. She is the author of *Focus on Composition* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978) and of articles on composition, including "Writing and Learning Across the Curriculum" in *College English* (41, 7, March, 1980). Her conference papers include CCCC, MLA, CCTE, and TESOL. She has recently co-authored a Hunter College handbook for instructors in disciplines other than English who undertake to assign writing in their courses.

Announcements

Call for papers

The MLA Teaching of Writing Division will sponsor three sessions at the MLA convention in New York, December, 1981. Session topics are 1. the relationship of literature to teaching writing; 2. the relationship of reading theory to teaching writing; and 3. the relationship of other disciplines to teaching writing. The deadline for proposals, in the form of a 200-word abstract, is April 1, 1981. Address proposals to Professor Win Horner, Chairperson, MLA Teaching of Writing Division, English Department, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211.

New editors

We announce with pleasure that the WPA executive committee, at its December meeting, appointed three new members to the *WPA* editorial board. They are Lynn Z. Bloom, College of William and Mary; Charles R. Cooper, University of California, San Diego; and John T. Harwood, Pennsylvania State University. The new editors replace three whose terms expired at the end of 1980: Enid Bogle, Timothy Donovan, and Nathaniel Teich. We regret losing these retiring members of the board and thank them for their critical acumen, hard work, and encouragement. We hope they will allow us to call upon their valuable experience and expertise from time to time in the years ahead.

We are happy also to announce that the WPA executive committee has appointed Joseph F. Trimmer, Ball State University, to the position of *WPA* Managing Editor. He replaces Richard Sterling, who has served in that position with distinction for the past year and a half. We appreciate his thoughtful, energetic contribution to the journal and to WPA, and look forward to receiving his continuing help and advice in the future.

Writing Program Effectiveness Project

Four faculty members at the University of Texas, Austin, have received a three-year FIPSE grant to develop a comprehensive set of procedures for evaluating nation-wide the effectiveness of college writing programs. James Kinneavy is project director. John Daly, Lester Faigley, and Stephen Witte will conduct the research. The project will focus on teaching writing (curricular practices and instructional techniques), writing processes and products, and the goals of post-secondary writing programs in a variety of settings.

WPAs and textbook publication

The NEH-Iowa Institute on Writing will sponsor a panel on "The Publishing Industry and the Profession" at CCCC in Dallas, March 26-28. The panel will include representatives of textbook publishing companies, authors of recently published texts, and writing program administrators who have attended the Iowa Institute. Background papers by participants discussing basic principles of textbook writing and publishing are available by writing to Professor Timothy Donovan, English Department, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115.

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. Application deadline: April 3, 1981. The institute will be offered again in 1982.

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. Application deadline, April 15, 1981. The institute is supported by a grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.

CAWS conference

The CUNY Association of Writing Supervisors (CAWS) will hold its sixth annual conference on writing April 3, 1981, at Roosevelt House, Hunter College. The conference theme is "Writing Programs Ten Years after Open Admissions." For further information contact Carol Schoen, CAWS Conference Coordinator, ACS/Seek Department, Lehman College, Bronx, NY 10468.

WPA in Arkansas

On October 25, 1980, the University of Arkansas, in cooperation with WPA and NEH, sponsored a one-day conference on teaching writing. The conference included a session on "The Administrator of Writing: The Organization of the Writing Program," chaired by Shirley Coleman. Also involved in this session were Dorothy McDonald, Jean Elliott, and Viralene J. Coleman. The conference leader was Evelyn Johnson.

Reference shelf

This spring MLA will publish *The Teaching Apprentice Program in Language and Literature*, edited by Joseph Gibaldi and James V. Mirollo. The book includes a survey of college and university teaching apprentice programs, including information on a wide variety of issues from types of training, supervision, and evaluation, to contractual agreements, funding, and departmental governance. It also describes 18 representative and innovative programs for training new teachers in composition as well as in literature and foreign languages. To order, write to the Office of Book Publications, Modern Language Association, 62 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10011. Price: \$7.

The *Journal of Academic Skills*, a publication of the Center for Academic Skills at City College (CUNY), publishes articles focusing on educational issues having to do with culturally diverse student populations. Volume 1, Number 1 (Spring, 1980), is an attempt to respond to problems faced by urban colleges in particular. For further information write Marshall Bellovin, Editor, *Journal of Academic Skills*, Center for Academic Skills, City College, New York, NY 10031.

Russell C. Long's "Originating a Basic Writing Course: Basic Problems, Basic Decisions," *The CEA Critic*, 43 (January, 1981), 33-37, offers a brief introduction to some of the problems—conceptual, institutional, and curricular—that a writing program administrator can encounter when creating a basic writing program or when making changes in an existing program. The article also suggests a few helpful, succinctly stated ways of dealing with these problems.

Alphabetical index, WPA, Volumes 1-4 (1977-1981)

- Bataille, Robert R., "A major problem in administering writing programs: Hiring composition specialists." 2, 2 (Winter, 1978), 9-16
- Bataille, Robert R., "Hiring composition specialists." 4, 1 (Fall, 1980), 17-21
- Bonner, Thomas, Jr., "Six steps toward departmental engagement in composition." 4, 2 (Winter, 1980), 20
- Brekke, Alice, "The impact of testing on one California university campus: What the EPT has done to us and for us." 3, 3 (Spring, 1980), 23-26
- Brick, Allan, "The CUNY Writing Assessment Test and the teaching of writing." 4, 1 (Fall, 1980), 28-34
- Brothers, Barbara, "Three kinds of writing workshops for English teachers." 4, 2 (Winter, 1980), 21-22
- Bruffee, Kenneth A., Editorial 1, 3 (Spring, 1978), 6-12
2, 3 (Spring, 1979), 3-5
3, 1 (Fall, 1979), 7-8
4, 1 (Fall, 1980), 7-9
- Bylaws, Council of Writing Program Administrators 1, 3 (Spring, 1978), 13-15
2, 3 (Spring, 1979), 10-12
4, 3 (Spring, 1981), 61-62
- Donovan, Timothy R., "Writing administration and the Ph.D. in composition." 2, 2 (Winter, 1978), 3-8
- Donovan, Timothy, and Ben W. McClellan, "Reflections on the state of the art: An interview with William E. Coles, Jr." 1, 2 (Winter, 1977), 3-10
- Dunn, Thomas M., "Writing in the sciences." 4, 1 (Fall, 1980), 11-15
- Farrell, Robert, Editorial 1, 2 (Winter, 1977), 1
- Findlen, George R., "A device for interpreting the results of student evaluation forms." 3, 2 (Winter, 1979), 25-30
- Flanigan, Michael C., "Observing teaching: Discovering and developing the individual's teaching style." 3, 2 (Winter, 1979), 17-24
- Fulwiler, Toby, "Writing across the curriculum at Michigan Tech" 4, 3 (Spring, 1981), 15-20
- Furcron, Margaret, "Eight steps in planning a regional conference." 2, 1 (Fall, 1978), 11-22
- Furcron, Margaret, "The WPA guide to planning regional academic conferences." 4, 3 (Spring, 1981), 23-51

Hairston, Maxine, "What freshman directors need to know about evaluating writing programs."	3, 1 (Fall, 1979), 11-16
Hoddeson, David, "On speaking and writing."	1, 2 (Winter, 1977), 13-17
Jewell, Walter, "The contribution of administrative leadership to academic excellence."	3, 3 (Spring, 1980), 9-13
Klaus, Carl H., "The Iowa Institute on Writing."	2, 1 (Fall, 1978), 11-22
Larkin, Greg, "The essential unity of language arts programs: Its pedagogical implications."	3, 1 (Fall, 1979), 25-28
Lehmann, Gary, "Using a checklist of writing skills."	1, 2 (Winter, 1977), 12
Lindemann, Erika, "Evaluating writing programs: What an outside evaluator looks for."	3, 1 (Fall, 1979), 17-24
Lyons, Robert, "The City University of New York Writing Assessment Test: A faculty-generated model."	4, 1 (Fall, 1980), 23-27
Lyons, Robert, "Faculty development through professional collaboration."	4, 2 (Winter, 1980), 12-18
Maimon, Elaine P., "Writing in all the arts and sciences: Getting started and gaining momentum."	4, 3 (Spring, 1981), 9-13
Marius, Richard, "Faculty indifference to writing: A pessimistic view."	4, 2 (Winter, 1980), 7-11
Nold, Ellen, "Helping faculty to make rewarding assignments."	4, 2 (Winter, 1980), 19
Raines, Ann, "Comment [on Fulwiler and Maimon]."	4, 3 (Spring, 1981), 21-22
Rankin, David, "A common-sense approach to administration."	4, 2 (Winter, 1980), 29-33
Skerl, Jennie, "Training writing lab tutors."	3, 3 (Spring, 1980), 15-18
Smith, Don, "Symposia contribute to public's understanding [of writing problems]."	1, 2 (Winter, 1977), 18
Teich, Nathaniel, "TSWE for placement in skills and basic composition courses."	1, 2 (Winter, 1977), 11
White, Edward M., "The California State University English Placement Test (EPT): Purpose and potential."	3, 3 (Spring, 1980), 19-22
Wiener, Harvey S., "President's message."	1, 3 (Spring, 1978), 4 2, 1 (Fall, 1978), 3 3, 2 (Winter, 1979), 7 3, 3 (Spring, 1980), 7 4, 3 (Spring, 1981), 7
Woods, William F., "Industrial management and teaching evaluation programs."	3, 2 (Winter, 1979), 9-16
WPA Board of Consultant-Evaluators, "Writing Program Evaluation: An outline for self-study."	4, 2 (Winter, 1980), 23-28

Selective subject index, WPA, Volumes 1-4

Administrative leadership

Bruffee, Kenneth A., Editorial	3, 1 (Fall, 1979), 7-8 4, 1 (Fall, 1980), 7-9
Jewell, Walter, "The contribution of administrative leadership to academic excellence."	3, 3 (Spring, 1980), 9-13
Rankin, David, "A common-sense approach to administration."	4, 2 (Winter, 1980), 29-33
Furcron, Margaret, "The WPA guide to planning regional academic conferences."	4, 3 (Spring, 1981), 23-51

Hiring

Bataille, Robert R., "Hiring composition specialists."	4, 1 (Fall, 1980), 17-21
--	--------------------------

Program development

Bonner, Thomas, Barbara Brothers, Robert Lyons, Richard Marius, and Ellen Nold, "Forum: Faculty development in composition."	4, 2 (Winter, 1980), 7-22
Donovan, Timothy R., "Writing administration and the Ph.D. in composition."	2, 2 (Winter, 1978), 3-8
Fulwiler, Toby, Elaine P. Maimon, and Ann Raines, "Forum: Writing across the curriculum."	4, 3 (Spring, 1981), 9-22
Skerl, Jennie, "Training writing lab tutors."	3, 3 (Spring, 1980), 15-18

Program evaluation

Hairston, Maxine, "What freshman directors need to know about evaluating writing programs."	3, 1 (Fall, 1979), 11-16
Lindemann, Erika, "Evaluating writing programs: What an outside evaluator looks for."	3, 1 (Fall, 1979), 17-24
WPA Board of Consultant-Evaluators, "Writing Program Evaluation: An outline for self-study."	4, 2 (Winter, 1980), 23-28

Teacher evaluation

Flanigan, Michael C., "Observing teaching: Discovering and developing the individual's teaching style."	3, 2 (Winter, 1979), 17-24
Woods, William F., "Industrial management and teaching-evaluation programs."	3, 2 (Winter, 1979), 9-16

Writing

Dunn, Thomas M., "Writing in the sciences." 4, 1 (Fall, 1980), 11-15

Testing

Brekke, Alice, "The impact of testing on one California university campus: What the EPT has done to us and for us." 3, 3 (Spring, 1980), 23-26

Brick, Allan, "The CUNY Writing Assessment Test and the teaching of writing." 4, 1 (Fall, 1980), 28-34

Lyons, Robert, "The City University of New York Writing Assessment Test: A faculty-generated model." 4, 1 (Fall, 1980), 23-27

Teich, Nathaniel, "TSWE for placement in skills and basic composition courses." 1, 2 (Winter, 1977), 11

White, Edward M., "The California State University English Placement Test (EPT): Purpose and potential." 3, 3 (Spring, 1980), 19-22

COUNCIL OF WRITING PROGRAM ADMINISTRATORS BYLAWS

Adopted December 29, 1977

Revised, June, 1980

I. Purposes*

Notwithstanding any other provision of these bylaws, the Council of Writing Program Administrators (WPA) is organized exclusively for educational purposes, as stated in section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and shall not carry on any activities not permitted to be carried on by a corporation exempt from Federal income tax under section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

No part of the net earnings of the WPA shall inure to the benefit of any member, trustee, director, officer of the corporation, or any private individual (except that reasonable compensation may be paid for services rendered to or for the WPA), and no member, trustee, officer of the WPA or any private individual shall be entitled to share in the distribution of any of the corporate assets on dissolution of the WPA.

No substantial part of the activities of the WPA shall be carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation (except as otherwise provided by Internal Revenue Code section 501 (h), or participating in, or intervening in (including the publication or distribution of statements), any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office.

In the event of dissolution, all of the remaining assets and property of the WPA shall after necessary expenses thereof be distributed to such organizations as shall qualify under section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, or to another organization to be used in such a manner as in the judgement of a Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York will best accomplish the general purposes for which the corporation was formed.

II. Membership

The Council of Writing Program Administrators will offer membership to directors and former directors of writing programs in colleges and universities across the country. By means of advertising in MLA, NCTE, CCCC, and other journals, directors and former directors from institutions of all kinds—private, public, urban, rural, two-year or four-year, large and small—will be encouraged to join. Since the Council wishes to encourage the membership of active program directors and former directors who will use the Council as a clearinghouse for exchanges of program information and as a base for promoting local programs, the Council will not solicit membership from other than program directors and former directors or those designated by their departments or colleges as holding administrative responsibility for an institution's writing program. In those schools, for example, that do not have a Director of Composition or of Freshmen English, the chair of a program steering committee or a regular faculty member without administrative appointment might well be designated by his or her institution as a potential Council member.

Membership in the Writing Division of the MLA and the CCCC should be corequisite with membership in the Council, thereby providing the Council and the institutions represented by it the influence and general support of the associations' larger memberships. To encourage exchanges of program information and to expedite the exchange, the Council will collect dues each year to be used for printing and distributing its journal and other necessary information, and for other expenses directly related to the operation of the organization as approved by the Executive Committee.

III. Voting

- A. Any dues-paying member is eligible to vote.
- B. The Executive Committee will consist of a President; Vice President; Secretary; Treasurer; and six elected members.
The Executive Committee will include representatives from different geographic regions and at least one representative from a community or two-year college.
- C. All officers will be elected to three-year terms. Other members of the Executive Committee will be elected to three-year staggered terms.
The Executive Committee will nominate candidates for offices.
A subcommittee of the Executive Committee, chosen by its members, will nominate candidates for the Board of Directors. Officers will not be eligible for more than two consecutive terms in the same office. All elections will be by mail ballot.
- D. General meetings will be held at the annual MLA convention, open Executive Committee meetings will be held at the CCCC convention, and the Executive Committee will meet periodically as needed.

IV. Goals

The Goals of the Council of Writing Program Administrators are as follows:

- A. to serve the interest of writing programs by educating the academic community and the public at large about the needs of successful writing programs.
- B. to promote cooperation among the various writing programs in two and four-year colleges throughout the country by sharing information and by defining common interests and needs.
- C. to enumerate conditions for the successful teaching of composition and to bring attention to these conditions so that college administrators will support realistic writing programs.
- D. to establish a clearinghouse of research on writing program administration.
- E. to work for the improvement of basic writing competencies of college students.
- F. to sponsor and support a journal which represents the goals and needs of the organization.
- G. to work along with public and private elementary and secondary schools in the development of successful writing programs.
- H. to review and to evaluate criteria used in judging students' writing and in establishing placement and proficiency standards in colleges.
- I. to explore funding sources for the growth and development of model writing programs.

V. Additional Procedures

- A. The Executive Committee will appoint the editor of the journal after requesting nominations from the membership. The Executive Committee will appoint the managing editor and the members of the Editorial Board with the advice of the editor.
- B. The Editorial Board will present an editorial policy for approval by the Executive Committee.
- C. The journal should periodically report programmatic research supported by The Council of Writing Program Administrators.

*The material in Section I is required of not-for-profit organizations by the Internal Revenue Service.

Past members, WPA Executive Committee

Lawrence Kasden (S), 1976-79
Donald McQuade, 1976-79
Richard Raspa, 1976-79
James Raymond, 1976-79

Past members, WPA Editorial Board

Enid Bogle, 1978-80
Timothy Donovan, 1978-80
Robert Farrell, 1976-77
Margaret Furcron, 1977-78
Winifred Horner, 1978-79
Michael Joyce, 1977-78
Erika Lindemann, 1978-79
Ellen Nold, 1978-79
David Sloane, 1977-78
Richard Sterling, 1979-80
Nathaniel Teich, 1978-80
Joseph F. Trimmer, 1978-79

In Volume 5

Forum: Part-time teaching, part-time teachers
Training WPAs

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.

