

Reenvisioning WPAs in Small Colleges as “Writing People Advocates”

Judith Hebb

Tom Amorose, the WPA at Seattle Pacific University, defines “small schools” as “four-year institutions that offer undergraduate education primarily,” that use full-time faculty and some adjuncts to teach composition on the first-year and other levels, that enroll fewer than 5,000 undergraduate students, and whose ethos of “smallness”—such as teaching orientation, liberal-arts mission, and individualized student attention—is tied to their identity (104). Although my four-year institution, where total enrollment hovers between 450 and 500, does not meet Amorose’s definition of small schools based on the principle of size (we are smaller than his “small”), I share the same concerns as all writing program administrators—successful, collaborative teaching and learning through worthwhile, challenging courses in an environment where faculty and students are encouraged to develop as individuals *and* in academics. While I do not claim that my local context is representative of all schools with total student populations of under 5,000, the voice of “petite” schools that lie on the far end of the college-size spectrum should be included in our thinking about the small-school experience in order to complete and enrich the diverse WPA narrative.

Amorose points out that the “small-school composition scene” has been eclipsed by large-university composition programs (at those institutions with more than 5,000 undergraduates) and that the models and discourse for WPA work developed from these “large-school cultures” have not sufficiently addressed the needs and the realities of the small-school writing program or its administrator (91–93). Certainly, these comments apply accurately to the smallest of composition programs, such as mine. After citing the research of Stephen P. Witte and Lester Faigley, Carol Hartzog, and Linda G. Polin and Edward M. White, Amorose concludes that “[d]ifference in size [. . .] corresponds to a panoply of qualitative differences in a writing program and its administrator’s material conditions” (92). These differences

include disparities in faculty development opportunities and differences in hiring practices and patterns as well as in classroom dynamics and activities, in who is doing the teaching, and in the effect of composition program decisions on staff (Amorose 92). However, writing programs vary widely because they are designed according to particular local circumstances (Amorose 92), as they should be.

Until recently, the small-school WPA culture has been omitted from the “official records” that we create and circulate among ourselves. Amorose indicates that this omission results in an “inexact description of the concept of WPA power,” which overshadows WPAs using alternative political instruments available to us (93). In fact, the existing discourse of power as a gauge of healthy growth and status is not particularly helpful to small-school WPAs, and so Amorose, along with Paul Hanstedt, was prompted to edit a special issue of *Composition Studies* in 2004 that focused on small-school WPAs “Composition In The Small College.” This issue expands the WPA narrative, but these essays don’t complete for us the entire span of WPA professionalism since it omits the petite-school culture (all are schools well over 1,000 undergraduates).

Christine Hult, a former editor of the *WPA: Writing Program Administration*, reports on the increase of published articles that comment on power and its use by the WPA in order to address a WPA’s issue of professional identity (125–26). Amorose, aware of the inherent difficulties on the small campus, notes: “The solo exertion of power when it is available, which isn’t often, can prove problematic and even dangerous on a small campus” (Amorose 94, 98). The effectiveness of the small-school WPA may, in fact, be eroded by the “exertion of power” (Amorose 94). The “boss-compositionist” model present at some larger institutions, while crucial in corporate politics, may not serve any WPA well, and, especially, not the heads of small-college enterprises, where WPAs would be well advised to examine and use their roles of authority and influence to be effective leaders (Amorose 102). Since the WPA may not be as politically marginalized at a small school as at a large one, she will not need to wield power as a weapon to achieve status within the local institution. On the other hand, taking a more feminist view of control, Jeanne Gunner’s idea (not model) of “collaborative administration,” which emphasizes “community, shared responsibility, and open exchange of information, ideas, and criticism” (254), is a step toward establishing the small-school ethos, which is more people-oriented than program-oriented. Of course, the personality of the individual WPA will determine how the leadership role is played out in the quest for professional identity.

By necessity, writing program administration performed at large institutions requires the management of a huge labor force and a global focus. I would liken the WPA in such a setting to the CEO of a large corporation, who operates at a distance from his writing faculty and may not know all of them personally. He or she must focus on the macro view, the “big” picture. On the other hand, writing program administration at a small college is more like the job of the major holder of a small, partner-owned business. Because the territory of the small business enterprise is necessarily smaller, the leader personally knows and works side-by-side with his business associates, and each person has a metaphoric capital investment in the success of the partnership. The smaller the school, the more localized the focus of the WPA—the “little” picture. While all WPAs may seek to balance the “people” with the “program,” I propose that the small-scale WPA will naturally think of himself/herself less as a “program administrator” and more as a “people advocate.” I do not mean to imply here that large-school WPAs value programs over people, but if the program is the focus of its administrator, the value of the people within that program may be diminished. My purpose is to suggest that my experience at a “petite” institution might well be able to inform the practices of larger-scale programs that could benefit from what Amorose sees as good advice, “incorporating small-school composition’s ethos” (101). At my petite school, the people *are* the program, more or less.

A “small-school ethos” is embodied in an intimate community. Because my college community is so small, most faculty, staff, and students know each other, many by name. This amicable advantage is also a disadvantage. Everyone knows what we do and say; what each individual does affects the rest of us to some degree. The small-school WPA, and to an even greater degree the petite-school WPA, needs to always be aware of being high profile and having campus-wide exposure. Doug Hesse, offering advice on ways to negotiate departmental politics, suggests that “small-school WPAs depend more on persuasion through a strong ethos” rather than “fiat” (43). Although I hold what Irene Ward calls “expert power,” derived from the perception that I am knowledgeable and from the perceived soundness of the writing program, I also have earned a “referent power” derived from my *ethos*, or how I treat others (64). According to Hesse, to achieve this *ethos* “expertise, competence, sensitivity to local situations, and pursuit of the greater good [are] essential” (44). Speaking to WPAs at large institutions with graduate programs, Louise Wetherbee Phelps similarly observes that “[r]hetorical skill and other sources of influence are far more significant to vigorous leadership in the academy than positional authority, even though the powers of the office are essential tools to do the job” (27). Whereas some WPAs may

have to rely on “hard sell” tactics to promote the writing program, my greatest functional asset is diplomacy. For the furtherance of the profession *en toto*, perhaps all WPAs could or should interrogate assumptions of power as a model for WPA work, particularly allowing professional narratives from institutions of smaller sizes to suggest ways of coping with situations that seemingly result from size but are essentially caused because we and the people we administer and serve are human.

Recently, a member of the WPA discussion list issued a call for WPA job descriptions because he was being asked by his administration for a written document specifying his duties. This plea for help was the impetus for me to compose my own job description, which ultimately included fourteen duties. I forwarded my written description to the issuer of the call. A couple of weeks later, he responded by thanking me for being the only one out of a huge list of several hundred members to respond! One hopes our colleagues’ silence does not indicate that WPAs generally operate without a written job description, which, as Hult points out (128), is crucial for validating the work we do. At my institution I am the only faculty member trained in rhetoric and composition; before my arrival three years ago, no organized writing program existed. Since there was no written job description for a WPA, I created this one for myself:

1. Review and contribute to current scholarship/practices in rhetoric and composition.
2. Define the writing program goals and design the curriculum.
3. Write course descriptions.
4. Write and institute policies.
5. Determine and administer placement instruments; make placement decisions for enrolling students into our school’s three levels of English 101.
6. Choose textbooks for all writing courses and write generic syllabi and writing assignments for English 101 and 102.
7. Train, observe, mentor, supervise, and evaluate all adjunct, junior, and senior writing faculty; participate in hiring decisions.
8. Assign teachers to writing classes each semester.
9. Provide leadership for English faculty, function as role model for teaching writing, and maintain professionalism among a *team* of writing instructors.

10. Encourage adjunct faculty by listening, offering suggestions, providing professional development.
11. Request books for the library, request teaching aids to support our writing program and materials for our department as needed (I oversee a small budget for the Department of Humanities and General Studies, which includes course instruction).
12. Meet with students, mediate disputes, and administer discipline when needed, including plagiarism cases in writing courses.
13. Evaluate our writing program.
14. Implement changes to improve instruction.

Edward M. White advises WPAs to use their “considerable power” for the “good of the program,” with the most important aspect of the WPA’s job being to improve instruction (“Use It” 111, 113). Indeed, all of the tasks I have listed in my job description exist to accomplish that end.

In my petite program, I strive to improve instruction by focusing on the people teaching writing. In my capacity as WPA at my institution, I function as the leader, manager, and advocate of a closely knit team of writing instructors, which includes one other full-time faculty member besides myself, one part-time faculty member, and adjuncts. As with many (if not most) small-school WPAs, besides directing the writing program and conducting active scholarship, I routinely teach a full load (four courses per semester) and serve on committees, fulfilling the expectations of the college.

Since my focus is on the people I work with to build a successful writing program, we interact and communicate with each other frequently. At least once a semester we have a team meeting that includes a pedagogical exchange, mutual support, and professional development; we also participate in teaching workshops. My team and I make decisions together, and I value their input even though I have the final authority and responsibility. I try to involve my team members in new policies, procedures, and pedagogies through collaboration and consensus, rather than by delivering them without consideration of colleagues’ opinions; we learn from each other. My team members are the players who must successfully carry out curricular and pedagogical reforms that I envision and implement if writing instruction is to improve.

Amorose suggests that the political and moral (largely symbolic) authority held by a small-college WPA may rise to the level of a sacred icon, which can be used to the WPA’s advantage (98–99). For example, questions on writing and grammar are referred to me by members of the administration

and the faculty, who view me as the local writing expert on campus. Further, I serve on the editorial board of our school magazine, I perform proofreading tasks for campus publications, I am the yearbook advisor, and I monitor unofficially the content of our school Web site. The academic dean sometimes delegates me, either individually or as a member of an ad hoc committee, to write official policies, procedures, reports, and descriptions. While some of these tasks are voluntary on my part because of my twenty-year mission to teach at the college level, I realize that my willingness to complete these assignments enhances my influence throughout the college community and my ability to lead. In a small-school culture, where the WPA has “little real power and diminished direct authority,” the “position carries with it significant moral authority” (Amorose 99). Because composition is valued so highly, “faculty and administration feel a need to personify it” (Amorose 99). Through my positive ethos as the “writing icon,” I earn my “right to speak”—meaning to express my opinion—when decisions made by faculty and administration affect the writing program.

Although small-school WPAs may regard themselves primarily as faculty, Joyce Kinkead and Jeanne Simpson, in their “crash course” in understanding the administrative culture, challenge WPAs to seize the “opportunity to shape and reshape the institution in ways that matter” by sharing with presidents and vice presidents “the responsibility to ‘serve and lead’” (77). Becoming effective change agents within their institutions requires finding “the common ground they share with other administrators” and using their knowledge and position actively (Kinkead and Simpson 68–69). Frequent interaction and positive exchanges involving common problems and issues with the other department chairs and with higher administrators is essential. For instance, because of the writing program’s positive ethos, I have been able to participate in administrative decisions regarding ancillary support services that especially affect freshmen enrolled in English 101 and English 102 but are not under the direct purview of the writing program. These decisions include a revised description of support services, policies, and procedures needed; implementation of these changes; hiring a staff member to oversee the support center; initiating a writing center; and hiring student writing tutors.

Despite the fact that my job includes some “paper shuffling,” most of my responsibilities are people-oriented, not task- or program-oriented. Similarly, Ward, citing research at universities with graduate programs, calls the WPA both a leader (a people-oriented system term) and a manager (a program-oriented term); the leader establishes the basic vision, and the manager implements the vision that the leader establishes (62). She claims that “increasing the leadership aspects of the job and balancing them with the managerial

aspects can lessen the risk of burnout” (Ward 63). New theories of leadership envision leaders as “facilitators and coalition builders,” who empower and serve others (Ward 63). These leaders lead through respect, understanding, acceptance, appreciation, interdependence, and fellowship (Ward 64). Ward defines the practices of leadership as “[e]arning a reputation as a leader, learning confidence in your own leadership, gaining a voice that others are willing to listen to, and having allies in place to help” (64–65). According to Lynn Bloom, viewing writing program administration as a creative process that combines necessary bureaucratic tasks with creativity (“the butterflies”) can make a significant difference to the people and programs it affects. She advises WPAs always to “envision the butterflies beneath and beyond” the confinement of managerial tasks (“Making a Difference” 73).

It is important to find balance between these bureaucratic and creative responsibilities. Even though my writing staff is small, each person on it is unique. As a creative “people advocate,” I must be attuned to each individual’s personality, strengths, and weaknesses. Once or twice a year I observe my team members teaching in order to assess their effectiveness in the classroom; they also observe each other and me teaching, and we talk together later. I have to discern ways to critique their performances in a positive yet challenging manner. I need to balance the individual and the team needs and then consider how these writing instructors can best contribute to the growth of our joint collaborative project. This part of my job is more satisfying than paper shuffling because the results are visible in the lives of the people who teach and learn in the program. Perhaps more importantly, a synergy results from a spirit of community. I agree with Ward’s declaration that some WPA work (which I see as “people work”) can be “worthwhile, rewarding, challenging, and downright fun,” while at other times the paperwork is “frustrating, draining, repetitive, and downright drudgery” (50). Indeed, based on her informal survey of fifty WPAs across the country, Bloom concludes that “the happiest WPAs are those who have transformed their jobs to emphasize what they do best: work with people, either through mentoring or more formal teaching, and solving problems” (“Are We Having Fun Yet?” 58). For me, people take precedence over paper.

Everything the WPA does affects either directly or indirectly the teachers and students in the writing program. Richard Gebhardt challenges doctoral students in writing program administration to be aware that “administration of a writing program goes beyond paper pushing”; writing program administration is “**macrolevel teaching**” because the writing director relates directly with the teachers on his or her staff (bold face his; 35). Through the ongoing exchange with my team’s writing instructors, I indirectly and consistently influence all our writing students. Clear, consistent communication

with my staff, coupled with ongoing training, fosters improved instruction and attainment of changes that trickle down to student writers. Those WPAs who teach writing courses while performing their administrative duties continue to shape student learning directly. They must strive to become people advocates as well as program advocates. As a petite-school WPA, it is easy for me to find those creative “butterflies” in the balance I need between the fun and the drudgery (code words for socializing and paperwork). That is, since my writing staff is small, I have time to invest in strengthening our working relationships and in supporting them personally and professionally (people tasks). Also true is that since this college’s writing program is small, I have time to complete my accountable responsibilities (all are paper tasks). As I scan my list of administrative duties, I see that every decision I make has been seen first from the perspective of “What aids learning at our institution?” I agree with Bloom that what I do best is mentor, teach, and solve problems; I believe that I’m well suited for the job that I enjoy. Although experienced WPAs would not necessarily recommend that a newly minted assistant professor (such as I was) be put in charge of a writing program, I was fortunate to have a positive mentoring experience at Texas A&M University-Commerce under Dr. Donna Dunbar-Odom that prepared me for this “petite” administrative role. Since the writing program enjoys a high status at my college and the work I do is highly valued, I earned associate professor rank at the end of my third year.

To lead effectively, WPAs must work well with the people below and above them in the political hierarchy; in fact, their success depends on “people” skills. Not only do WPAs lead, but, as Phelps contends, they are responsible for teaching leadership and cultivating leaders among their peers (6). She advances the metaphor of academic leadership as “turtles all the way down” (5). One should view oneself as a turtle on the back of other turtles whose own shell supports the weight of other turtles in a larger enterprise. Phelps proposes a collaborative model of “active participation and shared reflection among leaders and learners at all levels” within a dynamic system—layers of leadership at all levels of the academic organization (5–8). She views power as process, not product: “Power *is* activity, the energy of life made efficacious” (27). There are several reasons to view power as a dynamic, ongoing process. First, the professionalization of WPA work (and writing programs) is a continuing project that involves not only the identity of the field of rhetoric and composition but the professional identity of writing instructors. Second, each local writing program is a “work in progress”; changes enacted in the past and present should be extended and revised in the future. Third, we must be vigilant to assure that any ground gained in authority, influence, and allies is not lost as people come and go. Fourth,

leaders must be trained to carry on the work. Effectively training teachers in the writing program will make a major difference in changing any departmental and institutional expectations and practices (Bloom, “Making a Difference” 74).

My complex role as WPA at my college is what, in his primer for new WPAs, David Schwalm labels a “task,” not a “position”; that particular labeling literally means I have no “positional standing in the administrative hierarchy” (10). My institution is not unique in using as few “official” titles as possible, while paying for roles assumed well enough to make those of us assuming them comfortable. Being an effective WPA requires making positive contributions to the local college culture and forming successful relationships with people, who have more status at my school than can be gained through programs and titles. Although I hold no official WPA or director of writing title and no such title is consequently stated on my college business card, I have palpable affective standing among administrators, a clear signal that our small-school ethos quite literally puts people above programs. However, since I also serve as chair of the Department of Humanities and General Studies, my quasi-administrative WPA appointment is subsumed within a higher administrative position. I have come to believe, functionally, that this embeddedness is beneficial to the writing program because it eliminates one possible level of political clashes; I report directly to the academic dean, who is very supportive of the writing program and the English department. Furthermore, although I function as an advocate for the writing program and faculty, I can harmonize and balance the needs of the writing team within the context of the larger, inclusive department, which includes such wide-ranging faculties as those teaching literature, humanities, and philosophy.

As I reflect about my joint positions, I find that some of my WPA duties in fact overlap with my departmental responsibilities, such as developing long-range goals; initiating and evaluating curricula and programs; representing the faculty and the department to administration; providing leadership, reducing conflict, and encouraging professional development for the department; and recruiting, placing, mentoring, and evaluating faculty (see end note for a list of typical department chair tasks). This combined effort conserves energy and financial resources, compared with having two mutually exclusive job descriptions. This consolidation of labor also allows me more time to focus on *people* in the programs. Perhaps this freedom is directly proportional to the amount of money for which a department head is responsible; since my budget is small, I have fewer fiscal decisions to make than my counterparts at larger institutions.

Another benefit of these dual positions is that I have the best of two worlds—both making and dispensing knowledge and even, sometimes, wisdom. As Hult points out, while the department chair “has a truly professional, credentialed faculty to work with” and “can be a scholar *with* the rest of the faculty,” the WPA “often leads a constantly shifting staff of novices, [. . .] is perpetually engaged in teacher training and evaluation, [. . .] and must be the scholar *for* the composition ‘faculty’” (121). I have the privilege of engaging in intellectual discussions with other full-time colleagues and of brainstorming with the team members, including adjunct faculty, for innovative ideas. I work more closely with the adjuncts in my department than do department heads in other departments, where there may be little or no contact among colleagues. As a result of their professional status, the adjuncts on the writing team feel they are an integral part of a professional enterprise, not ancillaries to the “real” faculty. Before I arrived at this institution, the writing instructors were virtually ignored; they travailed as lone rangers with no support system. Furthermore, I succeeded in obtaining office space, computers, and travel funds so they can attend professional conferences. I encourage them to attend with me, and we sometimes present papers together. Since there are fewer players on my team than at a larger college, I can devote more individual time to each faculty member. Because freshman composition offers more sections than any other subject taught on my campus each semester, the writing staff is the center of the entire department. An adage like “Ain’t no one happy if mama ain’t happy” contains wisdom that’s applicable to my department—“Ain’t no one happy if the writing staff ain’t happy.”

My authority also extends outside of English and beyond the Department of Humanities and General Studies, which includes such wide-ranging disciplines as communication, developmental courses, English, history, humanities, mathematics, natural science, philosophy, physical education, and Spanish. Arguing for the “scholarship of administration,” Hult recommends that WPAs “use disciplinary knowledge to inform their teachers and improve their programs” (not only within the writing program but across the disciplines) (121). In my situation, positive team relationships are highly visible and crucial to the success of the writing program, and they greatly affect the rest of the faculty in writing across the curriculum. Because we all work together on a small campus, our colleagues interact with us writing teachers on a daily basis, and they report to us about the results of our work to lay the foundation for the critical reading, writing, discussing, and thinking that students will do in all academic discourse communities across our campus. Some other ways we make our positive ethos and the reputation of the writing program more visible are to publicize our team meetings to fac-

ulty and administration and to demonstrate our collaboration to students by sitting in on each other’s classes. Perhaps the size of a school is inversely proportional to the degree of personal relationships that must be built and nourished among the faculty, the influence of these associations on writing program administration, and the effect of administrative decisions on the writing staff.

I have had some informative and effective interchanges with my colleagues about writing across the curriculum. I take advantage of the privileges of my position whenever possible by delivering minitalks about the writing program, making the presence of the adjunct faculty known, soliciting comments about writing expectations across the disciplines, and offering help in designing and evaluating writing assignments. Besides validating our writing program, I am a resource for all faculty on my campus. I am highly visible around campus and in our monthly faculty meetings. I sometimes invite colleagues in other disciplines to come to my English 101 classes to talk about writing, both as process and product, within their particular fields. Some have asked me to review their writing assignments. Through such collaboration, we learn from and encourage each other in valuable ways. The students who attend these cross-curricular presentations have expressed gratitude for the demystification of writing from their other professors. I am continually delighted when our expectations and our views of writing overlap, reinforcing both my philosophy and my pedagogy. Furthermore, the other instructors on my team also benefit from this shared knowledge.

According to Amorose, the most effective tool that the small-campus WPA possesses is influence (99). At my small school, I have many “opportunities for persuading or convincing” (Amorose 99). I enjoy frequent interaction with everyone who works here, from the president to the maintenance crew. By fostering a positive working relationship with every person in this close-knit, small community, I hold influence across campus. I heed Amorose’s warning not to use my “very limited power” often, so that I won’t “lose it” (100). Throughout the college, we are all committed to our school mission, we follow the principle that people are more important than programs, and we share common values, which include critical thinking and effective writing. To further these goals, I know that my subtle influence is more effective than wielding a “big stick.” I am careful not to abuse the power I possess. I also realize that my influence may be both “near-limitless” and long-lasting, since my tenure at this institution will probably extend for years (Amorose 100). Inevitably, people transcend programs. Nurturing people strengthens and transforms the writing program, and establishing diplomatic relations with other campus entities validates it.

By being attentive to the political climate, the situated context of the writing program within my college, the centrality of my campus role, and, further, by building congenial relationships among my fellow workers, I have established a writing program based on sound composition theory and practice and have instituted several new policies. Any new WPA at a small school will have to assess how quickly changes in the writing program can be instituted; he or she may encounter resistance to change (Amorose 101). Thanks to the support I receive at my school, I have made significant changes in the writing program in my four years as WPA. We have added honors sections of English 101 and English 102. We mainstream all writers into English 101 in the studio model, in which developmental writers are enrolled in a one-hour writing workshop that supplements English 101. Before I came on board, these writers enrolled in English 100—focusing on grammar and paragraph-level texts—for three noncredit hours. We now have a placement exam for all entering students (including special students who may enroll in five or fewer hours) that consists of a timed essay. Students are placed in one of three levels of English 101 based on their SAT/ACT scores, high school GPA, this placement exam, and a first-day essay. Previously, the placement exam was a Scantron grammar test. All students are now required to be enrolled in English 101 or English 102 each semester after entering the college until they pass English 102; in the past, students habitually postponed their composition requirements until their last years. Since we want our students to be better prepared for writing needs throughout the college, the minimum passing grade for English 101 and English 102 is a C. Furthermore, we no longer accept CLEP or AP credit for English 102, and we accept only the test versions for English 101 credit that include a writing portion. Finally, we have established three English minors—in literature, in writing, and in English (which is a combination of literature and writing courses). In the fall of 2005 we will begin to offer four new degrees in English—BA, BS, and the BA or BS with a dual major in Biblical Studies. I managed to enact these policies relatively quickly because of my successful working relationships with the academic dean, the registrar, and the developmental writing teacher.

My authority and influence as a people advocate extend beyond the administration and the teaching staff to the students. At my college, the writing faculty share in common a semester-long topic and use the same textbooks and writing assignments. This allows the writing instructors to consult and encourage one another and to exchange ideas. The continuity in our first-year program also means that students may interact with others outside their own local discourse community about common topics and issues. At the end of each semester, I collect writing on the common theme

from each of the classes and edit a collection of student writing for our college Web site. In this way, I am functioning as an advocate for our students, who see that their writing is valued by this intellectual community and can be viewed on the Web by those beyond it. My position as WPA allows me to represent our students and their writing accomplishments to the outside world. This practice not only builds a positive *ethos* for our writing program but for our students as well.

The unique cultures of small and petite colleges demand that we reexamine and reenvision the work of the small-school WPA. The large-school WPA model does not adequately describe the role of the WPA who serves on a small campus, where influence, not power, is the most effective tool. The small enterprise must be attuned to the people who build and endorse the program. Because writing is valued as integral to our institution’s mission, educational goals, and identity, my personal authority and influence are more extensive, more intensive, and more crucial than they might be at a larger institution. This favorable gaze allows me to focus on building people relationships. Becoming a **Writing People Advocate** is the advantage small-school and petite school WPAs embrace. Consider that the **WPA** approach might be beneficial for writing program administrators at all institutions, regardless of size.

NOTES

The twelve top tasks for a department chair, identified through the Gmelch-Miskin survey, are as follows:

1. Recruit and select faculty.
2. Represent the department to administration and the field.
3. Evaluate faculty performance.
4. Encourage faculty research and publication.
5. Reduce conflict among faculty.
6. Manage department resources.
7. Encourage professional development of faculty.
8. Develop and initiate long-range department goals.
9. Remain current within academic discipline.
10. Provide informal faculty leadership.
11. Prepare and propose budgets.

12. Solicit ideas to improve the department. (Stygall 77)

WORKS CITED

- Amorose, Thomas. "WPA Work at the Small College or University: Re-Imagining Power and Making the Small School Visible." *Allyn & Bacon Sourcebook for Writing Program Administrators*. Ed. Irene Ward and William J. Carpenter. New York: Longman, 2002. 91–105.
- Bloom, Lynn Z. "Are We Having Fun Yet? Necessity, Creativity, and Writing Program Administration." *WPA* 26.1/2 (Fall/Winter 2002): 57–70.
- . "Making a Difference: Writing Program Administration as a Creative Process." *Resituating Writing: Constructing and Administering Writing Programs*. Ed. Joseph Janangelo and Kristine Hansen. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook, 1995. 73–81.
- Gebhardt, Richard. "Administration as Focus for Understanding the Teaching of Writing." Ward and Carpenter 34–37.
- Gunner, Jeanne. "Collaborative Administration." *The Writing Program Administrator's Resource: A Guide to Reflective Practice*. Ed. Stuart C. Brown and Theresa Enos. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2002. 253–62.
- Hanstedt, Paul and Tom Amorose, eds. "Composition In The Small College." Special issue, *Composition Studies* 32:2 (Fall 2004). (Note: This issue had not been released when I wrote this article.)
- Hesse, Douglas D. "Politics and the WPA: Traveling Through and Past Realms of Expertise." Brown and Enos 41–58.
- Hult, Christine A. "The Scholarship of Administration." Janangelo and Hansen 119–31.
- Kinkead, Joyce, and Jeanne Simpson. "The Administrative Audience: A Rhetorical Problem." Ward and Carpenter 68–77.
- Phelps, Louise Wetherbee. "Turtles All the Way Down: Educating Academic Leaders." Brown and Enos 3–39.
- Schwalm, David. "The Writing Program (Administrator) in Context: Where Am I, and Can I Still Behave Like a Faculty Member?" Ward and Carpenter 9–22.
- Stygall, Gail. "Certifying the Knowledge of WPAs." Brown and Enos 71–87.
- Ward, Irene. "Developing Healthy Management and Leadership Styles: Surviving the WPA's 'Inside Game.'" Ward and Carpenter 49–67.
- White, Edward M. "The Rhetorical Problem of Program Evaluation and the WPA." Janangelo and Hansen 132–50.
- . "Use It or Lose It: Power and the WPA." Ward and Carpenter 106–13.

