UNIVERSITY OF DENVER

Writing Program

Faculty Handbook

Faculty Handbook – July 2019

About this handbook

We've gathered information about aspects of the Writing Program of useful interest to its faculty, attempting to collate policies and procedures, background information on program structure, initiatives, and history, and general information about courses, faculty expectations, campus resources, and so on. Amy Kho and Alba Newmann Holmes edited the first edition of this handbook. Lauren Salvador edited the second and third editions. Ashlyn Stewart edited the fourth edition. Lauren Salvador and Keith Rhodes collaborated on the fifth edition. Please send queries, suggestions, or revisions to writing@du.edu or contact me at dhesse@du.edu.

Doug Hesse
Executive Director of Writing

Table of Contents

Writing Program Overview

The mission, vision, history, and structure of the University of Denver Writing Program

The mission of the DU Writing Program is to create a robust culture of writing on campus by helping students develop the complex writing abilities needed in contemporary academic, professional, and civic life, by helping faculty develop the knowledge and practices they need to support students in this development, and by providing nationally-recognized models for colleges and universities seeking exemplary practices in teaching and supporting writing.

Vision

- **A thriving writing culture**. The Program will facilitate a deep, diverse, and collaborative culture of writing and composing on campus.
- **Campus-wide understanding of writing**. All campus colleagues will understand writing as a multi-faceted set of rhetorical ideas and thoughtful processes.
- **Recognized expertise**. Campus colleagues will value Program faculty as generative partners in scholarly, programmatic, and outreach initiatives. Colleagues in the profession will value the Program and its faculty as sources of knowledge and best practices in the teaching of writing.
- **Rhetorically versatile students**. In their writing and composing, students will use versatile, innovative rhetorical thinking to engage effectively with larger networks in academic, professional, and civic life. Students will also ground researched writing and composing in diverse epistemologies, research methods, and genres.
- **Responsible writing and research practices**. Writers and researchers in the University of Denver community will use ethical writing and research practices to engage diverse communities.
- **Engagement with writing in the community.** The Program and its faculty will be valued by the community for supporting and promoting writing locally.

7 Points of Distinction

1. Our students get extraordinary attention.
2. Our writing faculty have exceptional expertise and focus.
3. The DU Writing Center cultivates a strong culture of writing, both on campus and beyond.
4. The Writing Program energizes writing across the whole campus.
5. Our students master approaches that are vital for writing in school, work, and life.
6. Our students write for a digital age.
7. Our students write impressively.

A Brief History

The University of Denver's comprehensive Writing Program, a freestanding department, reports directly to the Vice Provost for University Academic Programs. It supports all undergraduates as they complete three required writing and writing-intensive courses, each in sections of no more than 17 students, with additional WAC and WID experiences, enhanced by a well-staffed and supported campus Writing Center. To create these experiences, the university reallocated base budget dollars. A new Writing Program Director, Doug Hesse, was hired in 2005 to begin at DU July 1, 2006. Hesse, in turn, hired a Writing Center Director (Eliana Schonberg), an Office Manager, and the first complement of 19 full-time lecturers. At the same time the program was founded, the university also hired over 20 new tenure-line faculty in Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences to build capacity for writing-intensive First-Year Seminars (FSEM) and junior-level Advanced Seminar (ASEM) courses.

The Writing Program received an additional lecturer line in 2010, three additional lines in 2011, two additional lines in 2012, and one additional line in 2016, bringing the total full-time staff to 29: 26 faculty, a Writing Center Director, an Executive Director, and an Office Manager. On September 1, 2015, the lecturer positions were converted into a Teaching Professor series, with ranks at Assistant, Associate, and Full Teaching Professor.

Each professor teaches six courses per year—with up to 17 students per section, this means no more than 51 students per quarter—and receives considerable professional development and travel funding. The typical 0/3/3 load means no required teaching assignment in the fall quarter, which is typically devoted to faculty development, assessment, program research, and campus/community outreach. Program faculty do sometimes teach in the fall quarter by choice, either by re-allocating their annual teaching load, teaching in the Minor in Writing Practices (the "Minor"), or teaching certain courses in the General Education curriculum (FSEM and ASEM). Professors who are new to the program do not take any of those assignments, learning about those opportunities during their first year in the program.

The entire program is centrally (and symbolically) housed in office and classroom space in the Anderson Academic Commons (the university library)

Leadership

Executive Director
Doug Hesse is the Founding Executive Director of the Writing Program at the University of Denver and a Professor of English. The Executive Director is ultimately responsible for all aspects of the program, including the first-year curriculum and assessment; all hiring, professional development, and review; coordinating the ASEM program; providing faculty development and support for writing across campus; serving as supervisor to the Writing Center Director and other leadership; developing the program budget and representing program interests both on campus and off.

Writing Center Director
Juli Parrish is the Director of the Writing Center (WC). The WC Director is a faculty position that provides instructional support in writing to undergraduate and graduate students by establishing the effective operation of the WC. The position requires (1) a terminal degree in Rhetoric and Composition, English, or a related field; (2) graduate coursework in composition studies or equivalent professional experience and/or scholarship; (3) previous successful experience teaching college writing. The WC Director, who reports to the Executive Director of the Writing Program, is ultimately responsible for all policy and staffing matters involving the WC and works with the Executive Director to establish its budget. The WC Director is the public face of the Center, communicating with other administrators, faculty, students, and staff, and with members of the larger community in order to understand and support their expectations for student writing, and to keep current with writing theories and practices in diverse contexts.

The WC Director initiates long-range planning for the WC, teaches graduate and undergraduate consultants how to work effectively with writers, and is responsible for supervising and evaluating the WC staff and resources. To provide professional development for WC consultants, the WC Director will create training opportunities on campus and in the writing center community. The WC Director will also remain informed about current writing center theory and practice and engage in writing center scholarship through conferences and publications. Position responsibilities include the following:

- Teach, train, and manage a staff of consultants to give high-quality individual writing consultations and writing workshops.
- Set the policies of the Writing Center.
- Develop writing workshops and other writing support programs for classes, programs, and student groups.
- Work with the Writing Program Executive Director to develop activities that support instructors in the teaching of writing.
- Maintain records on consultations and outreach activities and assess their effects.
- Represent the Writing Center to the campus community by conducting outreach to administrators, instructors, and students.
- Teach within the Writing Program and may teach in another department in which he or she is qualified.

Assistant Director for First-Year Writing

Richard Colby is the Assistant Director for First-Year Writing. This is a ten-month position, with a salary pro-rated from the faculty's 9-month salary. The appointment term is three years and is open for renewal. The teaching load is 3 courses per year. Candidates must hold a current appointment in the teaching professor series in the Writing Program. The responsibilities of the Assistant Director for First-Year Writing include:

- Serve as program ombudsperson.
- Address student and WRIT faculty concerns related to the WRIT sequence.
- Assist with student questions and concerns during registration periods and the open weeks of each term.
- Resolve all transfer requests.
- Plan WRIT course offerings each year; work closely with the Office Manager to schedule faculty teaching assignments.
- Review teaching in WRIT courses. Provide formative feedback as the opportunity or need arises. Write annual evaluations of teaching for each professor and adjunct faculty member.
- Hire, train, support, develop, and review adjunct faculty members.
- Coordinate the assessment of WRIT courses, including drafting the annual assessment report.
- Participate in research and faculty development related to assessment.
- Serve *ex officio* on the Curriculum & Assessment committee. Participate in discussions of curriculum and pedagogy.
- Represent the Writing Program on the FSEM Committee.
- Serve as liaison between the Writing Program and Academic Advising.
- Perform other duties assigned by or negotiated with the Executive Director of the Writing. Program

Please feel free to contact the Assistant Director with any questions or concerns related to the First-Year Writing Program.

Writing Center Assistant Director

Megan Kelly is the Writing Center Assistant Director. This is a ten-month position, with three courses reassigned from the current faculty's responsibilities, leaving a three-course teaching assignment. The additional month's salary will be pro-rated from the faculty's 9-month salary. The appointment term is three years and is open for renewal. Candidates must hold a current appointment as a professor in the Writing Program. Responsibilities for the position include the following:

- Collaborate in teaching ENGL 4830: Writing Center Theory and Practice in the fall quarter, including working with the Writing Center Director to design the syllabus and assignments, collaborating on creating lesson plans, team-teaching the course, and commenting on student papers.

- Participate in mentoring new consultants, including conducting observations in the fall and spring quarters and holding occasional office hours in the Writing Center to be available for consultant concerns.
- Participate in interviewing and selecting new student consultants in spring quarter.
- Coordinate classroom workshops, including recruiting Writing Program professors to contribute to workshop efforts, coordinating faculty workshop requests, and expanding our collection of workshop materials.
- Collaborate with Writing Center Director to facilitate ongoing writing center research projects, including expanding the role of student consultants in these projects. The Assistant Director may also choose to start new projects.
- Assist with day-to-day operations in the Center, including scheduling consultants each term and occasionally standing in for the Writing Center Director by being "on call" by phone in case of trouble during evening and weekend shifts.
- Perform other duties consummate with the scope of the position as assigned by or negotiated with the Writing Center Director.

Office Manager

Joseph Ponce is the Office Manager for the University Writing Program. The responsibilities of the Office Manager include:

- Coordinate hiring of new faculty and Writing Center staff, including organizing interviews, arranging travel, processing background checks, submitting new hire paperwork, fielding new hire questions.
- Manage payroll for all faculty; support the WC Director in approving WC staff time cards.
- Set up payments/order supplies for faculty and student grants.
- Support Executive Director in budget management, including gainshare funds. Monitor and communicate budget issues and provide monthly budget reports.
- Administer all event logistics, including room rentals, catering, a/v, supply ordering, stipend & honoraria processing, etc.
- Order supplies for upstairs and downstairs offices.
- Complete monthly expense reports for office purchasing card and Director purchasing card.
- Process reimbursements for faculty or aid in the process.
- Provide administrative support for the Executive Director of the University Writing Program, Director of the University Writing Center, and Writing Program professors and adjunct faculty.
- Respond to general inquiries and provide basic information about the Writing Program.
- Coordinate research studies, including maintaining all study records and communicating with subjects and researchers.
- Assist with technology issues for faculty and Writing Center consultants.
- Enter schedule descriptions each quarter.
- Administer employee HR paperwork, records, evaluations, leaves of absences.
- Answer questions about DU benefits and HR processes, and directing in-depth questions to the appropriate HR staff member.

- Maintain and update program website.
- Organize Advanced Seminar (ASEM) logistics, including submitting new ASEM course proposals via Courseleaf, processing stipends for ASEM faculty, communicating with faculty and department chairs about ASEM course status, and updating proposal forms.

Program Components

First-Year Writing Sequence. After new students complete the First-Year Seminar—fall quarter seminars taught by DU faculty members on subjects in which they have unusual personal or academic interest—most students enroll in a two-course writing sequence in winter and spring quarters, usually in classes of 15. See more complete course descriptions in the next section.

Writing Center. Located in the Shopneck Family Writing Center in Anderson Academic Commons, the University Writing Center works with undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, and staff across the University of Denver campus in individual and group consultations and classroom workshops. WC consultations, which are collaborative, rhetorical, and non-evaluative, are available to the entire campus community with the exception of the law school. The number of consultations has grown over its years of operation; and in 2017-18, WC consultants conducted approximately 4579 individual sessions: 47% with undergraduates; 48% with graduate students; and 5% with faculty, staff, and alumni. These consultations are conducted by a staff of trained student consultants (about 2/3 of whom are graduate students and 1/3 are undergraduates) drawn from across campus and including a substantial cohort from the English doctoral program. The WC works with students at any stage in their writing process, from brainstorming to organization to stylistic questions, and on any topic; the WC provides help with writing in any discipline as well as with personal writing, professional writing, and multimedia projects. For a description of the ways in which Writing Program Faculty can work with the Writing Center, see the section on Professional Service in Chapter 2.

Minor in Writing Practices. Open to all undergraduates, this 20-credit sequence develops writing proficiencies and knowledge at a time when employers assert that writing abilities are paramount, when writing shapes civic thought and action, when writing is a means of personal development and social interaction, when writing is inflected by evolving technologies.

ASEM. Students must complete a writing-intensive Advanced Seminar Course (ASEM). The Writing Program provides faculty development and support for these classes.

Writing in the Disciplines. The program offers development opportunities and support for faculty in every department, from informal consultations to extended workshops. The goal is to help professors in other disciplines teach their students the ways of writing vital to specific disciplines and professions.

Assessment and Research. Through both focused and longitudinal studies of student writing, the program regularly assesses its effectiveness and contributes to the professional literature in rhetoric/writing/composition studies, as well as to other related initiatives.

Writing Classes

First-Year Writing: WRIT. The Writing Program is responsible for teaching the first-year writing course sequence, referred to by the course catalog abbreviation, "WRIT." During the fall quarter, incoming freshmen take a First-Year Seminar (FSEM) course, which introduces them to undergraduate academic topics and rigors. Writing Program faculty are eligible to apply to teach these courses, as are faculty from across campus. After completing FSEM, most students are required to take WRIT 1122, Rhetoric and Academic Writing, in the winter quarter, and then take WRIT 1133, Writing and Research, in the spring.

Advanced students (such as those with extensive AP or IB writing experience) may test out of WRIT xx22 or opt to take an advanced sequence of these courses: WRIT 1622 in the winter quarter and 1633 in the spring. Honors students must complete WRIT 1733. For more information about these classes and their goals, please see the Writing Program Courses section in Chapter 3 below.

FSEM. All DU students are required to take First-Year Seminar, usually in the fall quarter when they begin at DU. The Writing Program provides faculty development to FSEM faculty; however, FSEM is administered separately under Vice Provost Jennifer Karas. Writing Program faculty may apply to teach FSEMs. For more information on this program, see the Other Teaching Opportunities section in Chapter 3.

ASEM. After completing all other common curriculum requirements, each student must complete a writing-intensive Advanced Seminar Course (typically in their Junior or Senior year—this class must be taken at DU). The ASEM Committee reviews proposals from faculty across campus and approves ASEM courses. Doug Hesse is currently chairing the ASEM Committee, with administrative support from the Office Manager. The Writing Program provides faculty development and support for these classes.

Each ASEM is based within a faculty member's scholastic passion and area of expertise, and is designed for non-majors. The topic of the class is approached from multiple perspectives and some instructional time is given to writing, as well. While knowledge and professional skills found in a student's major and minor are important foundations for accomplishment, successful individuals also must be able to navigate a complex political, social, cultural, and economic environment that challenges more traditionally limited concepts of higher education and competencies; the ASEMs recognize this. Studying in this setting, students are asked to demonstrate their ability to integrate different perspectives and synthesize diverse ideas through intensive writing on that topic. Students in these courses write a minimum of 20 pages, some of which must be revised and polished, over at least three writing projects. They are also expected to revise writing based on feedback from the professor. The Writing Program works with faculty from across campus to design courses that will fulfill these goals. Writing Program faculty may apply to teach ASEMs; contact Doug Hesse.

Courses for the Minor in Writing Practices. The program offers several courses as part of a Minor in Writing Practices. Please see Chapter 3 for further detail.

Program as Campus Resource

The Writing Program offers development opportunities and support for faculty in every department, from informal consultations to extended workshops. The goal is to teach students the ways of writing vital to specific disciplines and professions by helping faculty develop efficient and effective strategies for assigning writing.

In addition to in-class workshops, faculty development workshops, and individualized one-on-one conversations about writing, the Writing Program also provides a number of publications and resources for DU faculty. These are housed on the Writing Program website and include: advice for DU faculty on creating effective writing assignments, helping students with the writing process, and responding to student writing; an online survey of writing practices and expectations administered to tenure-track faculty during Fall 2006; references to important scholarship about the teaching of writing; strategies for avoiding plagiarism; tips for running peer review; as well as resources for scientific and ethnographic writing projects. The program publishes several supporting materials, most prominently *Writing Beyond Writing Classes: Resources for University of Denver Faculty.*

Program as Professional & Disciplinary Resource

While the Writing Program's mission is to enhance the culture of writing on our campus, we are actively engaged in enhancing the culture of composition pedagogy beyond DU as well. Our program has served as a model for the formation and development of writing programs nationwide. We have presented about our program and its research at numerous conferences, including WPA, CCCC, WAC, WRAB, and many others.

Standing Committees

The Writing Program has historically been organized in committees; the various iterations can be explored in Appendix 2. In spring 2018, following extensive discussion in the Steering Committee and by the whole faculty, we decided to have two Standing Committees, with all other work performed by ad hoc groups, task forces, or individuals.

Steering Committee

Responsible for helping the Executive Director establish and implement Writing Program policies and practices. Four members of the committee will be elected to staggered two-year terms by the faculty. No member of Steering may be elected to a second consecutive term, though there is no limit to how many separate terms a faculty member may serve. The Executive Director will chair this committee, and the Writing Center Director will serve on it *ex officio*. Steering has these main duties:

- Appoint the Curriculum & Assessment committee. Develop any specific charges, if necessary.
- Work with the Executive Director to solicit, identify, and prioritize ad hoc efforts (events, publications, studies, initiatives, development activities, etc.) and to seek faculty members to carry out those efforts, providing coordination or advice for committee efforts.
- Coordinate an evaluation of the Executive Director.
- Meet regularly to discuss Writing Program matters, including ideas, observations, and questions that individuals or groups might bring to the committee as a whole or to individual members.

Curriculum & Assessment

Responsible for reviewing and assessing WRIT course goals, features, and policies for developing professional development and research opportunities related to teaching. Chaired by the Assistant Director for First-Year Writing. Steering Committee appoints 3-4 additional members. This committee has these main duties:

- Annually review goals and features for WRIT courses, and propose revisions to the entire faculty.
- Explore how our current goals and practices for first-year courses align with the current DU mission, vision, and interests. (For example, among the range of best practices for first-year writing—in our program and beyond—might other acceptable possibilities better align with the current DU environment?)
- Design and organize annual assessments of first-year WRIT courses, under the leadership of the Assistant Director for First-Year Writing.
- Identify teaching trends in our department, looking at such artifacts as course materials (syllabi, assignments, student work, etc.), teaching reflections, aggregate student evaluations, and so on. Produce occasional reports on findings.
- Identify faculty learning and professional development needs and opportunities related to teaching writing. Organize activities, events, publications, or so on, as needed.

Regularly Occurring Other Committees

Most years, there will be one or more Reappointment/Promotion Committees, elected to conduct reappointment and/or promotion reviews. Many years there will be a Search Committee. See Chapter 2 for committee formation guidelines.

Chapter

2

Writing Program Faculty

Faculty position definitions and the criteria and calendars for appointment, for annual review, for promotion and for periodic review

T**he Teaching Professor Series.** With fully benefitted positions with a range of duties and responsibilities, faculty appointed as teaching professors hold one of three ranks: Teaching Assistant Professor, Teaching Associate Professor, and Teaching Professor. Descriptions and distinctions between the three positions are detailed below. All professors teach courses, perform extensive professional service to the program and to the larger campus community, and remain involved in scholarly and professional efforts. Faculty receive funding for professional development ($500) and professional travel ($1000). The Writing Program pays for professor membership in NCTE/CCCC, provides a new computer every three years, and provides offices and many kinds of support.

Most faculty have a 0/3/3 teaching load (meaning courses are typically taught in the winter and spring quarters) in first-year writing sections capped at 15-17 students. Faculty can request a different configuration of quarterly teaching assignments by consulting with the Assistant Director for First-Year Writing. The fall quarter is given to curriculum and pedagogy development, assessment, research, and program/campus support; several faculty elect to teach First-Year Seminar (FSEM) courses in the fall quarter. In their teaching, professors closely follow the program's goals, features, and policies; participate in all faculty/program development activities; serve on committees; and perform assigned professional service work, which includes research and assessment, consulting in the Writing Center, and program outreach on campus, primarily helping other faculty on campus learn to support student writing effectively. The annual review process is weighted 60% teaching, 30% professional writing-related service to the program and/or campus, and 10% scholarly and professional work.

Appointment in the Teaching Professor Series

Teaching Assistant Professor. Appointment as a Teaching Assistant Professor in the Writing Program requires the degree, coursework, and teaching experience expected of a faculty member whose teaching, service, and scholarly work are consonant with current best practices in rhetoric/writing/composition studies. Candidates demonstrate clear promise not only for teaching

writing effectively but also for contributing to other programmatic missions. This chart represents features or criteria that describe candidates qualified for the Teaching Assistant Professor rank; they constitute hiring qualifications. As indicated in the chart, there are several ways in which candidates may fulfill these qualifications. We see all of these criteria as informing well-rounded skills that lead to excellent teaching.

Degree	Terminal Degree (PhD, MFA, DA, EdD, etc.)	Master's Degree (not preferred)
Education	Coursework or equivalent professional activities in Rhetoric & Composition or related fields.	Substantial coursework or equivalent professional activities in Rhetoric & Composition or related fields.
Teaching Experience	At least 2 years of successful experience teaching writing/related in equivalent setting.	At least 3 years successful experience teaching writing/related in equivalent setting.
Scholarly Engagement	Evidence of conference attendance / presentation; publication in related academic and public contexts; participation in research institutes or workshops or related civic initiatives.	Evidence of conference attendance / presentation; publication in related academic and public contexts; participation in research institutes or workshops or related civic initiatives.

Teaching Associate Professor. Initial appointment at rank of Teaching Associate Professor comes after a sustained record of teaching effectiveness and a clear promise of its continuation; this credential is essential. Appointment at this rank also indicates a solid record of effective professional service, with promise that this effort will continue, and evidence of scholarly or related contributions. Minimal qualifications include a degree appropriate for appointment as a Teaching Assistant Professor and 6 years of experience as Teaching Assistant Professor or equivalent.

Note: Initial appointments at the rank of Teaching Associate Professor may be made only with the approval of the Provost's Office, almost always prior to position being first advertised.

Teaching Professor. Initial appointment as Teaching Professor signals that an individual has demonstrated performance at a very high level as a faculty member in rhetoric/writing/composition studies. It requires a sustained record of teaching excellence at the highest levels expected in the profession, or it requires consistently strong teaching coupled with exemplary professional service, including to the campus and the program, service that enhances the quality of learning and teaching well beyond one's own classrooms. Significant scholarly achievement may be one aspect of the latter, but it may not be the sole or primary one.

Note: Initial appointment as Teaching Professor comes only with the prior approval by the Provost that the position be advertised at the level of full Teaching Professor.

Generally, candidates are expected to hold a terminal degree, although the absence of a terminal degree may be offset by a candidate who has demonstrated ongoing significant engagement with the field of composition/writing studies (usually through presentations and/or publications), along with exemplary performances in teaching and professional service. Coursework or equivalent professional activities in Rhetoric & Composition or related fields is required, as are 10 years of combined experience as a Teaching Assistant Professor and Teaching Associate Professor or equivalent.

Hiring Process for the Teaching Professor Series

- A search committee consists of the Executive Director of Writing as chair; two professors elected by their peers; and one or two professors appointed by the Executive Director for diversity (gender and/or background, areas of interest/expertise, etc.).

- Positions will be advertised through the DU hiring process, and all applications will be handled online through the DU Jobs website.

- Members of the search committee must maintain highest confidentiality during the search process. Until finalists are announced, all deliberations and decisions are internal to the committee. Search Committee members are required by DU to attend a training with human resources.

- The search committee will review applications beginning by a set date. A reasonable number of semifinalists will be selected for 30-minute phone or Zoom interviews. We will request writing samples, reference letters, and other information from these semi-finalists, and we will telephone at least one reference for each candidate.

- The search committee will identify at least two candidates for campus interviews for each position. We will aspire to schedule these interviews to occur within a two-week period. Prior to the visits, the search committee will make available application materials from the finalists. In addition to hosting one large group meeting, the committee will seek to have all faculty meet in a small group setting with each finalist.

- The search committee will solicit written responses from program faculty and selected other campus constituents. This input will be considered in a search committee meeting held to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the finalists and to arrive at recommendations.

- Strongly weighing the committee recommendation, the Writing Program Executive Director will make the final appointments.

Adjunct Faculty

The Writing Program hires a small number of adjunct faculty members to teach courses during the fall, winter, and spring quarters. Adjunct faculty members are primarily responsible for teaching, so teaching ability is a key criterion for adjunct selection, along with relevant degrees or coursework in rhetoric or composition studies. One priority is ABD status in the DU English graduate program, accompanied by experience working in the DU Writing Center. Seniority is

another priority.

Adjunct faculty members are invited to participate in all aspects of program life, including faculty meetings, professional development opportunities, and other campus events. Adjunct faculty are provided with office space, laptops, printing/scanning, and technology support during their tenure with the program.

Access to faculty course materials, such as syllabi and assignments, is available through the Writing Program's Portfolio site. These materials can be important resources for gathering ideas and formulating assignments. Just a note: if anyone would like to make use of any of the materials housed in the Teaching files on Portfolio, please contact the faculty member who designed and posted them—both as a courtesy and also to learn what modifications, if any, the author of the documents would recommend; many of the pieces posted are still works in progress.

Adjunct faculty members are paid $4200 per course; these are non-benefited positions. Adjunct faculty are reviewed through processes similar to those for professors, including review of course documents, observations conducted by the Assistant Director for First-Year Writing or other faculty mentors, and student evaluations.

The Assistant Director for First-Year Writing is the person to ask for any questions about university policies, curriculum, course content, or other questions regarding the role of an adjunct faculty member. Inform the Assistant Director if there are any safety issues, honor code violations, or other situations that hinder student learning and a collegial environment—whether in the classroom or elsewhere within the university.

Professor Responsibilities & their Weight in Annual Review

All faculty in the teaching professor series participate in an annual review process that occurs during the fall, and this process is tied to the annual merit process. Raises take effect in January.

Course teaching: 60% (elaborated below). Overall effectiveness in teaching assigned classes, based on the winter and spring teaching materials described below, and an analysis of teaching.

Components of the overall teaching rating are 1) quality of course designs in consonance with program course goals; 2) quality of interactions with students as reflected in responses to student writing, effective use of class time, and student course evaluations; 3) quality of annual teaching analysis; 4) Contributions to the quality of teaching program-wide, such as development and sharing of materials, mentoring colleagues, organizing teaching events, and so on.

Service to the program and to the campus: 30% (elaborated below). Includes such things as consulting in the Writing Center, working with students and faculty around campus, developing program or campus materials to support writing and teaching, participation in writing research projects, assessment, service on committees, participation in or leadership of co-curricular activities, participation in workshops or seminars (either led by the Writing Program or by other groups on campus), student organization advising, and so on.

Contributions in areas central to the program's mission (such as the Writing Center and its outreach or program research and assessment) will be weighted more heavily. Leadership roles that result in clear outcomes will also be recognized. Teaching in FSEM, ASEM, or writing minor courses may also be treated as service.

Professional contributions—research, scholarship, and/or creative work: 10% (elaborated below). Refers to broad contributions to the profession beyond DU. Includes such things as conference presentations or related scholarly activities, publications, service in professional organizations, scholarship of teaching and learning projects, work submitted and in progress, grants, and so on. May also include civic engagement activities centrally tied to the mission of the program and the university.

For example, working in a community literacy program or developing communications for a not-for-profit agency would count; helping build a Habitat for Humanity House would not (although it is a very fine thing to do). Contributions in areas centrally related to rhetoric and composition studies will be weighed more heavily, though outstanding work in any academic field will also be recognized.

Professors are expected to keep current in composition studies and to produce occasional research, scholarship, or creative work. This effort can take the form of talks, workshops, or local, regional, or national presentations as well as publications. Usually, we expect some modest, relevant professional activity each year, even if it's just attending a conference related to rhetoric and composition studies at which you are not presenting.

Elaboration of Professional Service Responsibilities

Because the professional service expectations are likely to be least familiar to new faculty, we're explaining them in some detail.

Shared governance and basic service to the program and the campus refers to the longstanding ways that faculty members have shared responsibility—with one another and with administrators—for vital decisions concerning the operations of universities, especially including matters of curriculum, policy, evaluation, and so on. Being involved in shared governance is a basic responsibility of being a university professor.

Committee Work. The Writing Program has a long history of committee service (see Appendix 2), though the roster of committees and their composition can change considerably from year to year. At present, the program has suspended most standing committee service. But since the program frequently changes its use of committees, committee processes merit further discussion by way of historical interest and general orientation to the work of the program. Generally, Professors have been invited to indicate a preference to serve on a specific committee, though committee appointments, including chairs for each committee, have been made by the Steering Committee. Committee chairs have seen that the work of their particular group gets accomplished. Most importantly, this means convening meetings, setting agendas, seeing that people are assigned to tasks that the committee is charged with doing, keeping things on schedule, and facilitating communication, both within the group and from the group to others. Chairs have not been expected to be experts, nor to do the lion's share of a committee's work, but rather they coordinate the efforts of the group, so that the group as a whole is able to accomplish the

committee's charges. Ad hoc committees are expected to adhere to these traditional guidelines.

Ad hoc Committees. From time to time, the program or the university will form ad hoc committees (sometimes called task forces) for the purpose of achieving a specified task or purpose, disbanding when that task is accomplished. An example in the Writing Program is when we need to form a search committee, as is described above. Examples in the University of Denver are the Renew DU and strategic planning committees. Some ad hoc committees are elected, but others are appointed.

Elections. Occasionally, the Writing Program holds elections to fill positions, such as seats on the Faculty Senate, on the Steering Committee, on hiring committees, and on reappointment and promotion committees. Candidates must carry a majority of votes cast in order to win a seat in an election. To accomplish this, we hold a series of run-off elections, as needed. For some elections, faculty may decline to participate as candidates. Candidates will sometimes be asked to provide a brief statement on the nature of their interest in the position.

Note: Shared governance and basic service are ongoing. Just as with faculty in every department on campus, so are writing professors expected to contribute to committees and similar efforts throughout the fall, winter, and spring quarters. Basic committee work knows no calendar, though the program and, generally, the campus respects the time between spring and fall quarters as a period when only extraordinary circumstances require faculty work. The "cost," if you will, of shared governance is doing the work when it needs to be done. The alternative is ceding all important decisions that affect faculty to distant administrators.

Professional Annual Service Projects

Every professor proposes an annual service project, normally for the fall quarter—though that project might also consist of teaching, as described below. When the Writing Program was formed, lecturers were assigned to teach only in the winter and spring quarters. This was done to allow faculty in the fall to serve as "a professional resource" to the program and the entire campus. The program has since formalized some of that effort, which is imagined as each faculty member devoting about 15-17 hours per week during the fall term (150-170 hours total) to a "professional service project," or else to teaching FSEM, ASEM, or a course in the Minor (or a fall WRIT course to make room for a Minor or ASEM course in a later quarter). We expect that shared governance and basic service, including faculty meetings, will require about 4-6 hours per week during the fall, which means that faculty will "owe" the program and campus some 25 hours or fewer per week. This leaves, by intention and design, a large amount of time during the fall quarter to develop and polish courses and to do one's own research and writing. Professors who reassign their teaching load to teach part of their annual load in the fall should expect to spend an equivalent amount of time on service projects throughout the year.

We have experimented with both "centralized" and "decentralized" annual projects—with a small number of projects developed by a central group to an array of projects developed by individual professors or groups of professors, respecting their discretion in defining activities that both suit their interests and advance program goals. We've settled on the latter approach, for reasons we explain below. But first, however, some practical information.

Early each September, professors will decide the professional service projects they will pursue during the year. They may develop projects individually or in self-organized groups, and people are certainly welcome to participate in more than one effort (see Initiatives and Projects, below, for some examples of projects that faculty have pursued). After receiving feedback, faculty will develop a brief final description of their project(s) and email it to the Executive Director by September 15. The description, which should be a few sentences to a paragraph, should a) briefly characterize the project; b) explain how it will further program goals; c) explain any methods and anticipated difficulties; d) make a case for program resources (if appropriate); and e) explain the outcome(s) or "deliverables" of the project, along with a timetable. We encourage projects that reach completion by December. However, we also know that some projects have longer durations; for them, interim rather than final checkpoints will probably be more appropriate. All professors will be asked to chart their professional service contributions.

What are examples of projects?

The Writing Center. The Writing Center is a top priority for the program, and skillful contributions of professors are crucial to its success. It is probably the single most important and valued service project. Each year a number of faculty members choose to fulfill a portion or all of their service commitment by working in and with the Writing Center. Writing Center needs vary from quarter to quarter, so faculty members should consult with the Writing Center Director and Assistant Director about potential service projects. Their contributions take various forms:

Consultations: Writing Program Faculty can serve as consultants in the Writing Center —taking a collaborative, rhetorical approach to working one-on-one with student writers in 45 minute consultations. Faculty member consultants typically contribute 2-6 hours per week, with additional hours during the first two weeks of the fall quarter as needed, while new student consultants are trained. Faculty who consult in the fall are often able to model effective consulting practices for student consultants, formally observe consultants, and hold conferences with them to discuss their consulting practices.

Faculty Consultations: Professors associated with the Writing Center may have the opportunity to work with faculty members across campus one-on-one regarding assignment design and evaluation; consult on book chapters, articles, or grant proposals; and to set up regular meetings with faculty members who wish to work on their own writing.

Workshops: Every quarter the Writing Center facilitates approximately 100 workshops tailored to specific classes or programs at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. These are facilitated by Writing Program faculty and consultants with teaching experience and may focus on process (i.e., brainstorming, outlining, revising, peer-review), discipline-specific concerns (such as citation style), or genre-specific writing projects (such as literature reviews). Facilitators meet with the requesting faculty member a few weeks in advance of the workshop to discuss the project students will be working on and to design a 45-minute to 1-hour workshop that fits the class's needs. This conversation also offers an opportunity to talk with faculty about assignment design and evaluation.

Training and Mentoring Consultants: The Writing Center offers its consultants a rigorous and ongoing education in the work of consulting with writers. In addition to taking a two-credit graduate course (co-taught by the WC Director and Assistant Director every fall), consultants regularly observe and are observed, participate in weekly small-group staff meetings, learn new ideas and practices for consulting,

and participate in resource and program development, research, and assessment. Staff projects vary widely; in 2018-19, projects included developing a workshop series on English for Academic Purposes, assessing how PhD students understand the role of the individual consultation in their dissertation-writing, and researching the relationship of disability to writing center history, just to name a few. During a recent year, four consultants presented at the International Writing Centers Association conference in Atlanta, and 20 consultants—including seven undergraduates—presented at the Rocky Mountain Writing Centers Association conference in Denver. Consultants benefit enormously from having faculty guidance and mentoring, working with individuals or small groups on a specific project across one or more quarters.

Programming, Research, and Assessment Projects: Faculty who are interested in working with the Writing Center in ways not listed here are welcome to develop new programs, take on research, or participate in assessment efforts in collaboration with the WC Director and Assistant Director.

Research Projects. The program has amassed huge volumes of student writing and other data since the program's inception. There are any number of projects to be done analyzing student writings collected for the portfolios, for example, or for writing awards. New projects could include interviewing groups of students, ethnographies of classrooms, having students perform writing tasks, studies of faculty writing practices on campus, and so on. Previous research projects have included the longitudinal study of writing, the electronic portfolio project, the analysis of student error, the writing in the majors project, and others.

Publications and resources projects. These projects include developing resources that could be useful for teaching, both within the program and across campus. Examples: identifying and compiling within Portfolio a number of articles and writings that could be assigned in WRIT courses; developing some videos for teaching certain strategies or concepts; developing some guidelines and resources for particular teaching situations (for example, video projects, or working with ESL students); articles for a program newsletter that distill key ideas for nonexpert readers; creating an event on campus; editing and publishing videos and recordings that we've produced of visiting speakers over the years.

The bottom line is that this project must create value related to writing, for the program (or groups of faculty within it) or for campus. To cite extreme examples, writing a memoir is a worthy undertaking, but it's not a service project. Creating an on-line anthology of readings for WRIT 1133, along with some teaching materials related to it, is a worthy service project.

Anticipated questions

1. Above there is mention of "making a case for program resources." What does that mean?

    Certain kinds of research projects might benefit from the investigator(s) being able to pay research subjects, hire people to do scoring or rating, and so on. The Executive Director will announce any funds available for this purpose and provide details about applying for them.

2. What if I don't have any ideas for service projects and don't wish to contribute to the Writing Center?

We will spend some time in faculty meetings discussing ideas for projects, and the Executive Director will outline several specific possibilities—which people can pursue or ignore, as their interests move them. Some of your colleagues are likely to have "larger" projects in mind that might benefit from team efforts.

3. What are "self-organized groups?"

We mean these pretty plainly as the phrase indicates. You might have an idea for a project that you believe will go better with two or more participants. You chat with some colleagues or send an email to the department's Charleslamb-l listserv ("Hey, I'm interested in X and wonder if anyone else would like to do X with me"). A few of you decide to team up, and you put together a joint project. Or, however else you want to self-organize.

4. I'm worried that a project might overlap with the "jurisdiction" of a standing or ad hoc committee. Clarification?

You should be familiar with a committee's charges and efforts and try to develop projects that don't fall under the "normal" purview of the committee. Those might include projects requiring considerably more data collection and analysis than the committee might do. A conversation with the Executive Director and with the committee chair should clarify things.

5. What about the potentially hazy area between "professional service" and "teaching development?"

Many service projects may well have strong teaching implications. For something to "count" as professional service, rather than as individual teaching improvement, it should have a couple of characteristics: it should be based on considerable research, of whatever appropriate kind, and it should result in materials clearly designed to meet the interests and needs of a broad group of program faculty.

6. What about projects whose "effects" are significantly outside the program?

Projects with the potential to shape campus reaction to the Writing Program need to be of high quality and consistent with broader program efforts. (A good example of such projects from the past is the Writing in the Majors Project, described below.) As a result, people planning such efforts need to be in careful conversation with the Executive Director.

7. Why has the program set up the fall project this way?

We're confident that Writing Program professors have individually and collectively developed the knowledge and perspectives to assume more agency. We think the program's collective goals will be advanced best at this point by supporting that agency.

The Annual Review Process

Overview. Formative assessments help people grow as teachers and members of the profession, and the DU Writing Program values this highly. At times, the university and other forces also require summative assessments, a judgment of how well individuals have performed during a certain time period. At DU, chairs and directors complete annual reviews early each fall. These become the basis of annual pay increases and, in the case of tenure-track faculty, they provide input on progress toward promotion and tenure. At DU, salary increases take effect January 1. The Executive Director of the Writing Program will ask you to submit materials by various dates (and explaining that process is the main point of the section below). The Executive Director will review them and meet with each professor each fall to discuss performance during the evaluation period. Shortly before the last week of December, the Executive Director will provide a summative review letter that also includes merit raise information. Following are the categories used for the annual review, with rough percentages assigned to each. For each, a professor may receive a broad rating of "Unsatisfactory," "Needs improvement," "Fully meets all expectations," "Exceeds expectations," and "Exceptional performance." The exact language of the prompts can be found further on in this chapter. For Activity Insight login instructions, see the discussion of Activity Insight/Digital Measures in Chapter 3.

General Annual Review Calendar (may be adjusted when deadlines fall on weekends or holidays).

September 15	Upload several documents and statements to Activity Insight (within PioneerWeb) 1. Self-analysis of teaching. 2. Copy of final WRIT xx22 syllabus for the previous year. 3. Copy of final WRIT xx33 syllabus for the previous year. 4. Three commented student papers from WRIT xx22. 5. Three commented student papers from WRIT xx33. 6. Statement of professional service contributions. 7. Statement of other scholarly and professional contributions. 8. Statement of goals or plans for the upcoming year. 9. Your current CV. 10. Optional illustrative artifacts.
October/November	Review conversation with Executive Director.
December	Receive written Performance and Salary Review.
Begin preparations for next year's review	
January 15	Week 1 syllabi for winter courses (uploaded to Portfolio).
March 25	Week 1 syllabi for spring courses (uploaded to Portfolio).
April 1	Three commented student papers from one assignment, plus assignment, from each different winter course that you have taught (uploaded to Activity Insight). Final full syllabi from winter courses (uploaded to Portfolio and Activity Insight).
June 15	Three commented student papers from one assignment, plus assignment, from each different spring course that you have taught (uploaded to Activity Insight). Final full syllabi from spring courses (uploaded to Portfolio and Activity Insight).

Review of Teaching: Details. The program strongly values multiple measures, including review of course documents, classroom teaching, student evaluations, contributions to the program's teaching mission and environment, and the professor's own reflective analysis. All professors will provide materials each year to document the quality of their teaching in WRIT courses and, optionally, their contributions to teaching in the program, on campus, or in the field.

Regular reflections on teaching are good pedagogical practice, are vital to the annual merit process, and serve important rhetorical purposes for the program as a whole. The quality of anyone's teaching typically is signaled by a combination of elements, including course design (as manifested, for example, in syllabi, assignments, and course materials); interactions with student writers (for example, classroom practices, feedback on writings, etc.); students' perceptions; student achievements; and, optionally, evidence of practices or materials that are adapted by others. All faculty will get feedback from the Assistant Director for First-Year Writing as well as from students, and all faculty will upload their syllabi to Portfolio.

A. Get Feedback from The Assistant Director for First-Year Writing. The Assistant Director for First-Year Writing (AD) will observe one course every other year, either in winter or spring quarter depending on the preference of the faculty member. New faculty are always observed their first year. Afterwards, the AD will write a note that describes what happened during the class and what seemed to be the goals of the class meeting, describes particularly effective moments in the class (including perhaps not only what you did but also what the students did), and offers some thoughts on future class meetings. The AD is available to observe additional courses if a faculty member would like additional feedback.

B. Have Students Complete Course Evaluations. We'll use the minimal survey required by the university, along with some additional questions that are especially pertinent to teaching in writing courses. Students are asked to respond to the following:

For questions 1-14, respond: Strongly Agree, Agree, Agree More than Disagree, Disagree More than Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree

1. I completed a substantial amount of writing in this course.
2. The course enhanced my understanding of writing and rhetorical strategies.
3. The course enhanced my writing abilities.
4. The course enhanced my skills of critical thinking and analysis.
5. The instructor showed a commitment to my development as a writer.
6. I revised papers after receiving feedback from the professor or my peers.
7. The instructor provided feedback in a timely manner.
8. I had a strong interest in taking this course.
9. The course was intellectually challenging.
10. I learned a great deal in this course.
11. The physical setting of the classroom contributed to my learning.
12. My classmates contributed to my learning.
13. Overall, this is an effective instructor.
14. Overall, this is an excellent course.

15.   Please write about the strengths of the course or instructor.
16.   Please write any suggestions for improving the course.

At DU, all faculty members' numerical evaluation scores are available online. These can be accessed via PioneerWeb, by clicking on the Courses tab, then clicking on the View Results button under Course and Teacher Evaluation box on the left hand side of the page.

C. Upload Syllabi to Portfolio and Activity Insight. Each quarter, upload to Portfolio two syllabi from each course you taught: A) The syllabus you hand out during week one (submit in week 1); B) A comprehensive syllabus that reflects the course as you taught it (submit in the week after the term ends). The final comprehensive syllabus should include all the assignments you made.

We ask you to upload syllabi to Portfolio for two reasons. First, professional development interests are served when syllabi can be seen by any member of the Portfolio community. Second, this is the easiest way to archive syllabi in an easily accessible fashion, which serves a variety of useful purposes (like transfer review).

If you use the "Standard Process" described below, you will also need to upload final syllabi to Activity Insight so that they become an official part of your review record. Be sure that you indicate a section for closer review in this version (which is fine to do for the Portfolio version, too). The Assistant Director and Executive Director will look at a single two- or three-week detailed segment of your course, which outlines in some detail what you did. You've got a couple of options. One is to choose a section of the course to render in some detail in the final syllabus; the other is to render the whole course in detail but choose one section that you want us to look at closely.

More Detailed Documentation of Teaching. Beyond this are two approaches to documenting your teaching. Option 1 is required for faculty in their first three years of teaching in the program but may, of course, be used by any faculty member. Option 2, addressed after discussion of the standard process, is available for anyone who has received three satisfactory teaching reviews.

Option 1: Standard Process. Document your teaching using the standard process in Activity Insight.

Activity Insight Review Prompts and Guidelines

1. Write a two- to four-page discussion of your teaching during the previous winter and spring. (You will have a limit of 14,000 characters and spaces in Activity Insight.) Explain such things as your goals and approaches, challenges you encountered, and ways in which you were particularly successful in fostering student learning. Emphasize any innovations. Also, discuss how you have enhanced teaching by others (developed common teaching materials, led workshops, done teaching observations or written teaching letters, participated in a course improvement project, etc.). Your statement will be effective if you can point to specific artifacts that document your claims (assignments, student papers, classroom activities, syllabi, etc.)

    Additionally, your statement will be compelling if you set your discussion in wider contexts, particularly in relation to developments in the profession, as reflected in books, journal articles, and ideas currently prominent in the discipline and in higher education. Finally, you might discuss what you have learned about the courses, yourself as a teacher, students, or student learning during the

previous year, and how it will inform your planning for future teaching. Optionally, you could also discuss some teaching and learning research questions that you find promising.

2. Please upload to Activity Insight a full final syllabus for one WRIT xx22 course you taught during the past year.

3. Please upload to Activity Insight a full final syllabus for one WRIT xx33 course you taught during the past year.

4. Please upload a full final syllabus for any FSEM, ASEM, or other course you might have taught during the previous year.

5. Please upload into Activity Insight three (3) commented student papers, combined into a single document, from one assignment in a WRIT xx22 course you taught during the past year. NOTE: If you're writing comments by hand on the papers, you can scan them into a single document in the Writing Program office. If you're commenting online, you can cut and paste the sets of papers into a single Word or .pdf document, perhaps with section or page breaks between them. The Office Manager can provide technical help for combining PDFs. Submit the set before the end of the term.

6. Please upload into Activity Insight three (3) commented student papers, combined into a single document, from one assignment in a WRIT xx33 course you taught during the past year. See #5 note, above.

7. Review of Service: Details.

   Explain your professional contributions for the period of September 1 to September 1 by uploading to Activity Insight a document of not more than 7500 characters and spaces. Promote yourself (but do consider your ethos), making the best case for your contributions. Explain what you were involved with, what your role was, what your specific contributions were, and how these efforts benefitted the program or the profession.

   Your statement should have two elements. First, it should report on your "fall project," the annual professional service project that professors do in lieu of fall teaching. Describe in some detail what you did, with particular attention to outcomes (for example, number and kinds of workshops you might have led as a writing center consultant or reports/studies completed or data gathered).

   For any projects still in process, that is, projects that couldn't reasonably be completed during the 150 or so hours expected during the year, provide a progress report. If you taught FSEM, ASEM< or a minors course instead of performing a professional service project, please provide a commentary on/report on/analysis of your teaching in that course.

   Second, it should report on your other program-related professional contributions throughout the year, and your specific contributions to writing committees. Annotated lists are fine.

8. Review of Professional Contributions: Details.

Please upload to Activity Insight a statement of scholarly/other professional contributions. Include publications or presentations, service to the discipline, salient campus or community activity, etc. Lists are fine. Limit: 5000 characters + spaces.

9. Statement of Goals for the Upcoming Year.

    This section should look forward rather than back. Upload to Activity Insight a statement of not more than 5000 characters and spaces that explains your teaching, service, and professional goals for the upcoming year, including your plans for your fall professional service. Be specific but also realistic.

10. Upload your Current CV to Activity Insight (as a document).

11. Optional (and perhaps uncommon). If you wish, upload additional artifacts you believe important to this review process. These could include things like letters, programs, copies of publications or documents, copies of presentations, slides, etc. Make sure they're clearly labeled and easily understood by a busy person dealing with lots of documents. These should be in a single document uploaded to Activity Insight.

Option 2: Teaching Portfolio. Faculty who have had three consecutive years of satisfactory teaching evaluations may either continue the established process described above or provide an annual teaching portfolio that demonstrates quality of teaching in WRIT courses. A digital version of the portfolio should be created and made available in a form easily accessible and useful to the Executive Director, the Assistant Director for First-Year Writing, and the Office Manager by September 15. Veteran teachers eligible and wishing to follow Handbook Option 2 should still write a brief statement, at least, in Activity Insight; that statement should characterize their teaching portfolios and describe how to access them. In order to address emergency situations, to establish an archive of how individual courses were designed and taught, and to serve as a resource to colleagues in the program, all faculty, even those electing Option 2, will continue to provide course syllabi in Portfolio.

The Reappointment and Promotion Process

Assistant Professors in the Teaching Professor Series undergo a third-year review, for reappointment for a second three-year term. In their sixth year, they are reviewed for promotion to Associate Professor. Associate Professors are reviewed every fifth year, until promotion to Teaching Professor. Teaching Professors are reviewed every seventh year. At each stage of the process, faculty need to complete a file that is reviewed by the Writing Program's Reappointment/Promotion Committee (RPC).

Promotion & Reappointment Review Timeline

By October 1 (twelve months before their materials are due). Individuals who are up for third-year, reappointment, and/or promotion review are reminded of this fact.

No later than May 1. Individuals who are up for third-year, reappointment, and/or promotion evaluation are reminded, yet again, of this fact.

No later than May 15 (before R/P committees are elected). Individuals who wish an early evaluation should make this request to the Executive Director.

No later than June 1. RPC members for the upcoming year are elected, following guidelines in "Committee Structure" (the next section in this Handbook).

In September. The RPC members will meet with the chair(s) of previous year's committee(s), who will share their experiences and knowledge. The RPC also meets to discuss processes, schedules, and elect a chair. **Note**: These will usually occur at the same meeting, with conversations with the previous chairs as one part and new committee business another part. Or they may be two separate meetings. The Executive Director will organize the meeting time(s).

October 1. Candidates submit dossiers to the Writing Program Office Manager. If this date occurs on a weekend, candidates may submit by 9am the following Monday.

December 15. The RPC writes a recommendation letter for each candidate, offering a rationale and citing review materials. The committee notifies the candidate of their recommendation in a short email (but does not send the full recommendation letter). If the RPC's recommendation is negative (the committee does not recommend reappointment and/or promotion), that email must include a brief explanation of which criteria were not met. That email serves as the memorandum required by the APT document. The committee gives the full letter and the email to the Office Manager to be included in the candidate's portfolio.

January 15. The Executive Director writes his or her recommendation, notifying the candidate in a short email (but not sending the full letter). The Executive Director sends the complete portfolio, consisting of the Executive Director's letter, the committee's letter, and the candidate's full dossier to the Vice Provost for University Academic Programs. The Vice Provost submits the full dossier, with her or his own recommendation, to the Provost, who makes a decision and recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

March/April/May. For third-year reviews of Teaching Assistant Professors, and for Reappointments as Teaching Associate Professor, the Vice Provost makes a decision to support

or reject the department recommendations, then conveys that decision to the candidate and to the Executive Director. This completes the process for third-year reviews. For all other reappointment or promotion reviews, the Vice Provost makes a recommendation to the Provost. The Provost makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees.

June. The Board of Trustees approves promotions and reappointments. The Provost notifies the candidate, the Vice Provost, and the Executive Director.

If a candidate has been granted an official leave of absence for medical, family, or personal reasons, he or she may request to have a reappointment/promotion decision delayed for a year. The Writing Program, through the Director, will support these requests and advocate to the University. [Otherwise, only in rare circumstances will an extension be given for submitting a dossier late (for example, a family emergency or a clear health issue, such as a candidate getting the flu in late September and requesting an extension until October 10, or a candidate having to provide health care to another). Any faculty member seeking an extension *within the year's submission cycle*—that is, for a situation that arises in the fall and does not require an official leave of absence--must promptly communicate their request and rationale in writing with all members of the committee and the Executive Director; the committee and the ED will meet to approve or reject the request.

Reappointment/Promotion Committee Structure

All faculty up for reappointment or promotion will be evaluated by a Reappointment/Promotion Committee (RPC). In years when there are six or fewer candidates in the Reappointment/Promotion cycle, there will be a single committee of five members. If there are 7 or more faculty up for Reappointment/Promotion, the program may have two committees; each committee will generally review one category of candidate. (For example, a third-year review committee, a promotion to full committee, etc.) Committees may divide into subcommittees, if they choose, each attending to a subset of candidates for focused work, writing, and making recommendations to the whole RPC; however, all decisions will be made by a vote of all five members.

Make-up of the committee(s):

1. Each RPC will consist of five program faculty who are in the teaching professor series.

2. Committee members will be elected by faculty who are in the teaching professor series.

3. One member will be elected from each rank: one assistant who has successfully completed third-year reappointment, one associate, and one full.

4. Two members will be elected at large.

5. In the event that any rank has three or fewer members, we won't elect a member from that rank; instead, we'll elect an additional at-large member.

6. Excluded from the pool are those with exceptional extenuating circumstances who make a formal request to the Steering Committee or those who served in the previous year and who request exclusion.

7. No professors may serve on committees reviewing one another; in other words, Professor A may not serve on a committee reviewing Professor B while B serves on a committee reviewing A. Professors may not review colleagues with whom they are partners or have similarly significant conflicts of interest. Obviously, professors may not review themselves, and so professors up for review will be excluded from the pool if fewer than 7 faculty are up for reappointment and promotion.

8. Members will serve one-year terms and, as dictated by the APT guidelines, will elect a chair from among themselves for the year.

RPC Responsibilities

Because the committee best understands the teaching, service, and research of our colleagues, its careful and responsible evaluation of their materials will be imperative to a successful promotion or reappointment. The committee's recommendation will hold the most significance as the portfolio moves through the process; the Executive Director's recommendation is also significant.

Committee Meetings. As per the timeline, the RPC should meet at least twice during the process. At least one meeting will be with the previous year's chair(s) and to discuss processes & elect a chair as noted above. At least a second meeting will be to discuss/vote on recommendations for the candidates. The Executive Director will convene the first meeting, provide any contextual information, and answer questions. The committee chair may schedule any additional meetings deemed necessary. The committee should establish a detailed timeline for the process, including interim deadlines when each committee member intends to review the portfolio, and when the recommendation meeting will take place. Each committee member should be given at least a week with each portfolio they are expected to review. As per the university APT guidelines, meeting minutes should be kept and retained for all meetings held by the committee. The minutes are a record of the meeting and should be included in the file.

Committee Communication. All communication between the committee and the candidate(s) about review/promotion should be copied to all committee members. Any special request that a candidate has should be communicated to all committee members, although the RPC Chair should respond to the candidate on behalf of the committee.. Of course, as the candidates are also our colleagues, we expect that there will be moments when a candidate has a simple question that does not change the process. Candidates should pose those simple questions to the RPC Chair, who may answer on behalf of the committee; if the Chair has any questions whether a question is "simple," he or she should share it with the committee.

Individual committee votes and discussions about each candidate are to remain confidential during and after the process. If a committee has a concern about the confidentiality of the process, they should talk to the Executive Director.

Requests for Missing Information. If the Committee perceives that a dossier is missing required or crucial information, the Committee may request (through the Chair) that the candidate provide it in a timely fashion, generally in a day or two. Candidates are ultimately

responsible for submitting complete information. The RPC request is a collegial effort to remedy inadvertent omissions that may compromise candidates.

Recommendation. When a recommendation decision is reached, the committee shall write a recommendation letter explaining carefully how the candidate did or did not meet the criteria for review/promotion. The decision, but not the letter, should be communicated to the candidate in a short email, with all committee members and the Executive Director should also be copied in the email. That email, along with the committee's decision letter, should be included in the candidate's portfolio as it goes forward.

As per the university APT guidelines, recommendations to reappoint, promote, or deny reappointment require a simple majority vote. If a dissenting voter feels strongly, that voter can write a separate report to be included with the promotion file, but in this specific case, no names should be attached to either the positive or negative recommendation. In the case of a unanimous or majority positive or negative recommendation without strong dissent, all committee members will sign the recommendation letter.

In the case of a negative recommendation, the candidate should consult the university APT guidelines, section 7, Reviews and Appeals, and they should contact the Executive Director.

Third Year Review

- For the 3rd-year review, the candidate will submit annual review materials submitted to the Executive Director in previous years, plus new materials from their 3rd-year, as well as the Executive Director's letters to the candidate. In addition, the candidate will submit a professional statement, as detailed in the section below on "Assembling the Review and Promotion File."
- This process will follow the timeline explained above.
- The period under review for this process is the time since the original appointment as a Teaching Assistant Professor (usually about 2 years).

Review for Reappointment and Promotion (Teaching Assistant and Associate Professors

- According to the timeline above, the Executive Director will notify Teaching Assistant Professors who are required to be reviewed for promotion to Teaching Associate Professors and Teaching Associate Professors who are required to apply for reappointment or promotion.
- Candidates may request delaying for one year their evaluation for reappointment or promotion to Teaching Professor. Decisions to grant this request will be made by the Provost, in consultation with the Vice Provost and Executive Director.
- Teaching Associate Professor candidates may apply either for reappointment as Associate Professor or for promotion to full Teaching Professor. Criteria for reappointment shall be the same as those for promotion to Associate.
- The period under review for the Promotion to Teaching Associate Professor process is the time since the candidate's original appointment as a Teaching Assistant Professor (usually about 5 years).

- The period under review for the Promotion to Teaching Professor/Reappointment as Teaching Associate Professor processes is the time since the candidate's original appointment as Teaching Assistant Professor, though substantial weight will be given to work performed since the promotion to Teaching Associate Professor.

For each Teaching Assistant Professor candidate, Reappointment and Promotion committees will reach one of two decisions: promotion to Teaching Associate Professor or do not reappoint. For each Teaching Associate Professor candidate, the RPC will reach one of three decisions: promote to Teaching Professor, reappoint as Teaching Associate Professor, do not reappoint. The criteria for reappointment as Teaching Associate Professor will be those for original promotion to the rank.

Review for Reappointment (Teaching Professor)
- According to the timeline above, the Executive Director will notify Teaching Professors who are required to apply for reappointment.
- Candidates may request delaying for one year their evaluation for reappointment. Decisions to grant this request will be made by the Provost, in consultation with the Vice Provost and Executive Director.
- The RPC will reach one of two decisions: reappointment as Teaching Professor or do not reappoint. The criteria for reappointment as Teaching Professor will be those for original promotion to the rank.
- The period under review for the Promotion to Teaching Professor/Reappointment as Teaching Associate Professor processes is the time since the candidate's original appointment as Teaching Assistant Professor, though substantial weight will be given to work performed since the promotion to Teaching Associate Professor.

Guiding Philosophy of Reappointment and Promotion

A. Preamble

As it does for all aspects of faculty appointment, reappointment, and advancement, the university APT document provides a broad framework for promotion. Within this framework, the Writing Program has adopted a philosophy of reappointment and promotion that reflects its unique character, mission, and circumstances while also acknowledging the roles and appointments of its faculty in the Teaching Professor Series. Here is the DU APT framing language:

4.1 Philosophy
The University is committed to academic excellence as determined principally by teaching, scholarly research and/or creative activity, participation in shared governance, and service to the University, profession, and public. Both promotion to a higher academic rank and reappointment are primary ways for recognizing such excellence in performance. Decisions about the promotion of a faculty member shall be based upon high standards to ensure that the candidate possesses qualifications which meet current University, college, school, division, department, and center expectations. It is recognized that standards for promotion may change over time.

As we improve our quality standards for faculty performance, faculty members who may have qualified for promotion at some past time might no longer do so. As we state and invoke higher standards, however, we shall avoid unfairness to previously appointed faculty members, which might be caused by retroactive application of higher standards without reasonable time and opportunity to meet these standards.

4.2   Policies for Promotion
Promotion to a higher rank by the University is primarily recognition of excellent performance in teaching, scholarship, and/or creative activity. Consideration is also given to contributions to the shared governance of the University and to professional/public service. The qualifications a candidate shall possess to be promoted in rank are specified in Sections 3.6-3.8.

Promotion to a higher rank implies recognition by a faculty member that, concurrent with the honor and privileges awarded, there are continuing obligations to academic excellence, professional growth, and service.

Promotion shall occur only after an exhaustive evaluation has been made of the candidate's merits. Service at a lower rank shall not, in itself, constitute grounds for promotion.

An essential component in promotion is a positive judgment by a faculty member's immediate peers and colleagues, both intra- and extra-mural, regarding the candidate's performance.

B. Philosophy of Promotion within the Writing Program

The criteria for promotion within the Writing Program derive directly and crucially from our program's mission "to create a robust culture of writing on campus by helping students develop the complex writing abilities needed in contemporary academic, professional and civic life, by helping faculty develop the knowledge and practices they need to support students in this development, and by providing nationally-recognized models for colleges and universities seeking exemplary practices in teaching and supporting writing." Needless to say, that mission is a *living* one: it is embodied in the concrete practices of the diverse faculty who carry it out individually and collaboratively, in the vision of the future that we are called upon to invent together, and in the history that together we have already shaped.

Paramount to this mission is teaching, which is broadly understood to include not only instructing students (in classrooms and elsewhere) but also professional development with faculty colleagues (within the program and across campus), and to a smaller extent within broader fields relevant to the study of writing and within broader publics in which it is practiced. Promotion criteria must, therefore, reflect the primacy of teaching, foremost in classrooms but also writ large in other aspects of our work, including our professional service and other contributions.

Central to this diverse, collaborative, and inventional work is the field of Rhetoric and Composition. Indeed, Rhetoric and Composition furnishes not only much of the subject matter that we teach in the classroom, but the rich and evolving language, repository of concepts, and repertoire of practices through which the faculty communicate, cooperate, and create as a program. It is the *lingua franca* of our Burkean parlour, so to speak, and as such all Writing Program faculty are expected to engage with it. That engagement can and should take many

forms: publication and presentation, certainly, but just as importantly also, attending professional meetings, activities and conversations; serving as reviewers or committee or research team members in the field; teaching rhet/comp related courses (as in the minor); translating or employing the field's knowledge and practices for/with others, both colleagues on campus and publics beyond; and so on.

By developing and approving criteria based on our program's mission, vision, and history we ensure that our expectations for promotion reflect not only institutional values but also our shared values as writing faculty. We may revisit and revise criteria from time to time, as a regular and healthy practice to foster clarity, ensure consistency, and realign our expectations with our mission.

The Writing Program evaluates the promotion portfolios of individual faculty against our agreed-upon criteria, not against the portfolios of other faculty in the program, nor elsewhere on campus, nor in the profession beyond. There are no quotas. We promote all candidates who meet our criteria. Initial, crucial recommendations will be made by committees of peer colleagues who exercise careful judgment and practical wisdom. We are confident that committees can and will act in good faith for the collective good of the Writing Program by evaluating portfolios, applying our stated criteria, and adhering to our processes.

Our criteria are vitally determinative, but they are not—nor can they be—strictly algorithmic. Indeed, they cannot be, given our mission. A robust culture of writing is by definition diverse, collaborative, and inventional: it values diversity in that healthy cultures are characterized by difference—in our case, differences in pedagogical approach, in underlying philosophy, and in experience and expertise. It values collaboration because cultures that are not only healthy but robust recognize that differences and the commitment to work across them are the most vital source of energy. It values invention because a robust culture can only sustain itself by continually reinventing itself in response to the surrounding ecosystem—the changing needs and aspirations of our students, the shifting terrains of campus and community cultures, the evolving environment of writing and the study thereof.

Athough they state important measures, our criteria are governing heuristics, not formulae or checkboxes. Given our program's larger community of practice, we expect candidates to exercise their agency, representing their work by framing it within specific criteria to demonstrate the quality of their performances in each category. We also expect committees to exercise agency in assessing how those representations achieve standards of overall quality in categories, including when some elements are stronger than others. We recognize that assessing portfolios is an interpretive act in which committees exercise practical wisdom within the guidelines of specific criteria, especially as they weigh breadth that represents many activities within the program versus depth that comes through perfecting a significant activity over time. We hire all faculty with the belief that they can demonstrate the qualities necessary for promotion under the APT and program guidelines, although we also acknowledge that, due to any number of factors or circumstances, some individuals may not be able to do so, including within specific timeframes.

Three Reminders
A. Foundational Documents: Your Hiring Letter and Reappointment Letters

When you are hired, you receive an initial hiring letter. Whenever you are reappointed, whether with or without promotion, you receive a new letter setting out your new terms of appointment. Keep these letters in a safe, accessible place, and consider making both paper and electronic copies. These documents form a critical foundation for your reappointment and promotion decisions, and they will set out any unusual terms that vary any of the information set out below. The Office Manager also keeps copies of these letters, so you may request a copy if you have misplaced yours.

B. Governing Campus Document: APT
The following Writing Program requirements work within governing framework established by DU's Policies and Procedures Relating to Faculty Appointment, Promotion, & Tenure, commonly referred to as the "APT."

C. Early Promotion
The DU APT document allows faculty to seek promotion to the next rank before being required to do. Doing so offers unique advantages, but it also entails unique risks. Candidates should carefully consult the DU APT requirements before deciding to seek early promotion.

Making Your Review & Promotion File
This section provides an overview of the review or promotion file's rhetorical situation, advice about writing the cover letter and preparing the other sections, and advice about how to choose artifacts to illustrate teaching, service, and scholarly contributions. In the last section, we provide criteria and potential examples of what might be valued for each element. Following are the components of a file:

   a. Professional statement, the contents of which are commensurate with the following breakdown: 60% teaching, 30% service, 10% scholarship.
   b. Table of contents.
   c. Criteria for evaluation statement (optional).
   d. CV.
   e. Annual review letters from Executive Director of Writing.
   f. Artifacts.

   1. For teaching: 60%.
   2. For service: 30%.
   3. For scholarly and related work: 10%.

The reappointment/promotion file demonstrates a faculty member's accomplishments to an audience of immediate colleagues and, ultimately, of colleagues and administrators across campus. Central to that file is a statement that presents and explains the candidate's accomplishments in relation to established criteria, persuading readers that their work satisfies criteria. A crucial complement to that statement is a set of artifacts, framed by analysis and explanation, that documents and illustrates the candidate's accomplishments. Candidates should create a coherent and compelling narrative of their work as teachers, citizens of the program and university, and scholars. As explained further below, the quality of the artifacts chosen to represent one's work and one's ability to synthesize and make connections among these artifacts will serve better than simply amassing a large quantity. **This**

reappointment/promotion file may be assembled either in a 3-ring binder format or as a digital portfolio. Please see the Office Manager for examples.

Rhetorical Situation of the Promotion File. Probably the most important thing to keep in mind is the rhetorical situation. Your promotion file will represent you at various stages, to various audiences. Probably the most crucial is the departmental level, where a group of your colleagues face the task of trying to determine whether the body of your work, as represented in your file, fulfills the criteria for reappointment or promotion. They are looking for clear and compelling evidence of your performance.

Generally, reappointment & promotion committees will want evidence that allows them to determine whether the record fits the requirements. Administrators beyond the program will judge the quality of the program committee's analysis and decision, so you want to help your colleagues, as compellingly and concisely as possible, to understand and represent your work so they can write a letter that states a decision and provides a compelling rationale. This letter, along with your file, will go to a college-level committee or administrator. That group/individual will write another evaluative letter that will go to the Provost and then, ultimately, to the DU Trustees for final approval.

The further your file moves up the process, the more people will pay attention to your CV, your cover letters, and the letters written by each evaluative group along the way. And the less they will pay attention to the artifacts. At the department level, however, the artifacts matter a great deal, and how you present and interpret them goes a long way toward helping your colleagues on the departmental committee interpret and present them to others. Remember that, at every level, each group is trying to determine one thing and one thing only: does the career represented in the file fulfill the established promotion criteria?

A. Professional Statement (Generally 3-7 pages). The candidate's professional statement frames the entire portfolio and makes an argument to the committee that your work meets the criteria for promotion. There are many ways to approach a document such as this, and different approaches will work more successfully for different faculty. You might think about whether there are themes that carry across your multiple areas of work, whether in terms of a theoretical lens you apply to your teaching and your research or in terms of a particular population with which you engage particularly well in both your classes and your service. You might find it helpful to treat this as a narrative with a beginning, middle, and end; or you may prefer to treat the teaching, service, and research sections as independent units with their own internal logic.

Whatever approach you take, think about how you can make an argument for the value of your work to date and draw connections for your readers, including for readers who may be unfamiliar with our field. How does your teaching, service, and scholarship connect to and contribute to the Writing Program and the university's larger goals and missions?

If you have any doubts or confusions, think of the statement as having three sections: Teaching, Professional Service, and Scholarly Contributions. Make each of them a heading. Given its primacy in our evaluative criteria, the Teaching section should be the longest, and so on.

Within each section, you might identify a theme or construct a narrative. Within your teaching section, one narrative strategy would be to show how and why your teaching has developed and progressed over time. For example, how and why have you modified assignments, or classroom practices? How

have your interactions with students and colleagues—and your understanding of the professional literature and best practices—inflected your teaching over time?

If you describe Writing Center workshops as part of your service contribution, you might, for example, talk about the types of work that go into creating and facilitating your workshops, the results you have seen for colleagues across campus who are involved with your workshops, the results for students who attend the workshops, and the impact that doing these workshops has had on your own teaching.

In describing your scholarship, you might find it useful to identify any coherent themes evident across multiple projects as a way of demonstrating a set of planned or emerging research interests. The lack of such a thread would not necessarily reflect poorly on your scholarship, but the ability to do so would be viewed as a positive.

Aside from constructing a narrative, consider that you do need to make an argument that your work meets the criteria for promotion; as such, your narrative likely should speak to those criteria.

B. Explicit Criteria for Evaluation. Members of the RPC Committee will look closely at the extent to which your file meets the established criteria for promotion. You have some choice and agency in directing their attention to specific Criteria for evaluation of your work. For example, promotion to Teaching Associate Professor relies in part on evaluation of effective performance across 6 of the 11 categories for Quality of Teaching, with at least one from Section A. One applicant, for example, might choose to provide artifacts to show evidence of quality of student outcomes but choose not to include artifacts showing evidence of how this person's teaching methods and materials have been used by others. In the Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion, you are asked to choose among several possible criteria (with some constraints and stipulations) and several possible artifacts for those criteria.

Please state explicitly the categories you have selected for review. You should do this through the table of contents, but you might also include headings within your professional statement, naming and supporting the categories you've chosen. As a matter of clarity and rhetoricity, help the committee understand and evaluate your work according to the criteria.

C. Table of Contents. To aid committees in navigating your portfolio, include a table of contents indicating which artifacts you have chosen to support which criteria.

D. CV. Include a copy of your most recent CV.

E. Annual Review Reports from Executive Director of Writing. Include all annual review reports from the Writing Program's Executive Director. If you have not kept these for yourself, they can be accessed through Activity Insight. Note that for some candidates, the Executive Director's reviews in 2015, 2016, and 2017 were oral, not written; hence, some candidates will not have a written report for those years. Further Note: Some faculty have confused the annual notification of **annual merit letters** (which typically come from the Provost's office in December and which announce any salary increases) with the **Executive Director's annual review reports** (which each year assess teaching, service, and scholarly/additional contributions).

F. Artifacts

Generally, these should be roughly proportional in volume to their weight in evaluation and provide support for the criteria the candidate has chosen.

    a.   For teaching: 60%.
    b.   For service: 30%.
    c.   For scholarly and related work: 10%.

There are advantages to living a professional life with an eye toward eventually producing a review or promotion file at various junctures. The promotion criteria make clear that it's the cumulative contributions and accomplishments over time that matter. Second, as we noted above, the selection and presentation of your artifacts is crucial. Decide which are the very best examples of your accomplishments. Put them front and center. Discuss them especially in your cover letter. Relegate secondary materials to secondary positions. Your evaluators' judgments are not done by the pound or the pixel but, rather, by the quality in relation to the established guidelines. Any artifacts that need brief explanations in order to make them comprehensible to others, should, of course, have those explanations attached. Clarifying explanations are not intended to take the place of the cover letter.

Potential activities for demonstrating accomplishments and presenting artifacts as illustrations or documentation. Examples from throughout one's career may be used to show accomplishments, but primacy will be given to work performed at DU and, given the APT expectations for growth, substantial weight will be given to work performed since the last review/promotion.

The Role of Artifacts in Illustrating Accomplishments

As part of their application for reappointment or promotion, candidates should articulate and illustrate how their efforts for the period under review satisfy the criteria. They most effectively do so through a combination of writing persuasive explanations/representations of their efforts and curating a compelling and persuasive set of artifacts to illustrate and document those efforts. Remember that candidates are making a case that they have achieved certain criteria, as a way of showing accomplishment in our three categories: teaching, professional service, and scholarly/other contributions. Artifacts are one means to that ends. Artifacts help to demonstrate a candidate's range, breadth, and/or depth of engagement, and as such, they have some work to do as a collection as well as being potentially meaningful individually. Artifacts do not "stand by themselves." Candidates need to introduce and contextualize them.

In selecting and representing artifacts, candidates should keep in mind that their artifacts can be of different kinds and serve different functions. Some artifacts might attest mainly to questions of "what" (i.e., that something happened), while others demonstrate "how" and "why" (i.e., clarifying the processes related to, outcomes of, or meaning of a thing that happened). Some artifacts might "speak for themselves," but many will benefit from a few sentences or a paragraph explaining their importance or how they demonstrate a criterion. Think of artifacts as supporting and providing evidence for narrative claims made in a candidate's Professional Statement or in specific sections. (One strategy would be to include a short (a page or two) set of artifact introductions at the beginning of the teaching, service, and other contributions sections of the portfolio.)

Candidates are encouraged to consider some balance in their collection of artifacts. For example, an individual artifact that lists a series of efforts might be balanced with an artifact that offers

insight into one or more of those efforts. Doing so will help committees to see how artifacts collectively build a case for a particular criterion.

Not every achievement or activity must have a corresponding artifact. In some cases, a rhetorically astute explanation, perhaps with a note about how readers might learn more, will be compelling in its own right. Again, it is the case made, not simply the artifact presented.

Might an artifact be cross-listed, as illustration of two different criteria? Yes, if the activity/accomplishment represented by that artifact is substantial, and the candidate provides a compelling rationale in both explanations that point to the common artifact. It is worth noting that faculty may carry-out cross domain work or work that at once fulfills both teaching and service or teaching and research or service and research goals and purposes.

Candidates have a great deal of discretion in choosing artifacts, with a few exceptions (for example, making a case for course design without syllabi is problematic). The suggestions in the sections below are examples but not the only options. Overall, regardless of which artifacts a candidate chooses to submit, the collection should furnish persuasive evidence of claims made in the narrative statement and in articulations of how the candidate met criteria, documenting and illustrating the candidate's work.

Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion Decisions

For all reappointment and promotion considerations, the Writing Program uses the following criteria.

A. Quality of teaching (60%)

1. Criteria
Satisfactory performance in teaching as demonstrated through meeting several criteria, as described for each rank.

SECTION A:
- Quality of course design.
- Quality of response to student writing, coaching, feedback, etc.
- Quality of student outcomes.
- Quality of interactions in the classroom and in other structured teaching settings.

SECTION B:
- Quality of teaching statements, analyses, and reflections.
- Quality of student evaluations of teaching.
- Course development with programmatic implications.
- Development of teaching methods and materials used by others.
- Evidence of professional development related to teaching.
- Evidence of professional development from external workshops or institutes related to teaching.

- Evidence of "teaching teachers" (leading workshops or seminar series for colleagues in the program, elsewhere on campus, or in the profession).
- Evidence of relationships with community partners connected to community-engaged courses.
- Quality of co-curricular teaching of students ("teaching" that occurs in not-for-academic-credit situations).
- Teaching awards.
- Evidence of pedagogical innovation in service of the program's goals and mission

2. Documentation
Potential artifacts include, but are not limited to, the following:

a. General overviews
- Student evaluations (official).
- Annual teaching reflections.
- University evaluations and informal summative or formative assessments that candidates may design or conduct on their own.
- Letters or other feedback from colleagues with whom the candidate collaborated or who observed the candidate's teaching and/or other work with students.
- Letters or other feedback from community partners involved in service-learning classes with the candidate.

b. Sample instructional materials
- Sample materials that show reflective teaching (lesson plans, teaching notes/reflections, explanations of engagement with scholarly pedagogy articles, etc.).
- Sample materials developed with or used by other faculty (syllabi, assignments, lesson plans, etc.).
- Videos or recordings of classroom teaching or meetings with students.
- Sample materials produced for students (syllabi, assignment prompts, rubrics, websites, PowerPoints, videos, podcasts, etc.).
- Commented drafts or other representations of feedback.

c. Evidence of results
- Artifacts that demonstrate "outcomes": student papers with comments, student projects of other kinds.
- Evidence of presenting on a teaching panel for other teachers, parents, or students on campus.
- Documentation of student writing awards, *WRIT Large* publications, and COMPosium participants.

d. Recognition of expertise
- Documentation of invited talks about your teaching.
- Publications related to teaching/pedagogy (on CV and/or copies of entire publication).

- Teaching awards.

e. Evidence of growth
- Documentation of attendance and/or participation at professional development workshops or other trainings (such as CCESL or off-campus workshops).
- Documentation of attendance or presentation at teaching-focused conferences (CCCC, NCTE, CLAS, etc.).
- Certificates from professional development work.

f. Teaching outside the classroom
- Materials related to directing independent studies; supervising research projects, internships, and other forms of co-curricular teaching; letters from community partners.

B. Quality of service (30%)

1. Requirements

Satisfactory levels of performance in program service as demonstrated through meeting several criteria, as described for each rank. By service, we mean efforts beyond classroom teaching that contribute to creating a robust, collaborative culture of writing across and/or beyond campus. This service includes activities that, for higher ranks, will span increasing numbers of the following types of work, from any category.

a. Professional Projects that Advance the Program's Mission and Vision
- Consistent and substantive efforts supporting the work of the University Writing Center.
- Development of (or extensive revisions to) program curriculum.
- Research projects that advance the program mission, whether in the program or across campus.
- Leading WAC/WID faculty development workshops, groups, activities, etc.

b. Service to the Program
- Consistent and substantive work on program committees and related ongoing events and efforts.
- Substantive work on events or initiatives beyond those hosted by committees.
- Innovation or leadership of specific projects, events, or initiatives.

c. Service That Extends Beyond the Program
- Mentoring of colleagues and others, which might include designing or substantially revising programs to facilitate mentoring activities or serving as a faculty advisor for a student group or serving on honors theses committees.
- Work on university committees and initiatives.
- Civic or community engagement efforts that advance the program mission and are in keeping with the **CCCC Statement on Community-Engaged Projects in Rhetoric and Composition**.

- Service awards or other types of external recognition.
- Professional service of quality to the field locally, regionally, or nationally.

d. Teaching That Counts as Service
- Regularly teaching FSEM, ASEM, and/or courses in the Minor in Writing Practices.

2. Documentation

Potential artifacts include, but are not limited to, the following:

a. Writing Center Work
- Consulting philosophies or other narrative articulations of an approach to consulting.
- Pedagogical materials developed for use in consulting, including handouts.
- Descriptions of interactions with faculty or staff, including narrative of meetings.
- Pedagogical materials developed for use in classrooms and other outreach situations, including sample workshop plans, slides, handouts.
- Evaluations of consulting or workshops, email endorsements from faculty.
- Descriptions of Writing Center mentoring activities such as observation reports or teaching activities developed for consultants.
- Narrative descriptions of contributions to ongoing Writing Center research or projects, narrative connections of consulting to larger programming, curricular, or pedagogical goals/initiatives.

b. Program Events and Special Initiatives
- Artifacts or narrative descriptions of committee work or initiative work including things such as programs, advertisements (in, for example The Bridge, flyers, slides made for electronic screens), photo or video (or textual?) records, etc.
- Evaluations or feedback about events or special initiatives.
- Research/assessment/documents produced on behalf of the Writing Program, i.e. assessment reports and recommendations; narrative description, including but not limited to changes implemented or partnerships formed, etc. as a result of the research/assessment.

c. Service to the University or Community
- Artifacts produced in conjunction with or on behalf of university committees such as memos, reports, programs or initiatives, letters of recognition or endorsement from colleagues on university committees or initiatives, correspondence.
- Description, documentation, and assessment of community engagement work, including things such as lists of clients using a community writing center site, materials prepared for workshops or presentations at community partner sites, photos of or programs from events organized with a community partner, letters from members of partner organization, documentation of grant applications applied for and received, narrative descriptions and self-reflections of community work, correspondence.

- Artifacts indicating external recognition like copies of awards, clippings, announcements, flyers, etc.

C. Quality of scholarly and related professional contributions (10%)

1. Criteria

Satisfactory levels of performance in scholarly and other contributions as demonstrated through meeting several criteria, as described for each rank.

- Presentations, publications, and performances.
- Publication and/or presentation to academic or general publics that advance, even indirectly, the program, the discipline, or the university.
- Presentation at conferences, institutes, seminars, etc.
- Scholarly publication in rhetoric/writing/composition studies.
- Scholarly publication in other areas.
- Other, "nonscholarly" publications/rhetorical performances: articles, op-eds, reviews, blogs of quality with a significant readership, etc.
- Publications composed in partnership with community organizations or used by community organizations.
- Creative publication/performances.

Other professional activity

- Participation in events that facilitate and further scholarly or creative engagement such as conferences, institutes, seminars, reading series, etc.
- Leadership of off-campus events that facilitate professional development for others, such as workshops, institutes, seminars.
- Creation of events that facilitate and further scholarly or creative engagement such as conferences, institutes, seminars, reading series, etc.
- Award or external recognition for scholarship and other contributions.
- Professional service of quality to the field locally, regionally, or nationally, including editing publications; serving on committees; reviewing manuscripts or promotion files; serving on thesis committees, etc.
- Professional service of quality (related to writing) to communities and community organizations locally, regionally, nationally, or internationally including composing or editing publications; serving on committees; planning and hosting events, etc.
- Consulting about writing to groups, organizations, schools, companies, etc.

2. Documentation:
Potential artifacts include, but are not limited to, the following:

a. Suitable Indirect Evidence for familiar items
- Excerpted CV listing scholarly contributions.
- Annotated lists of all presentations at conferences, institutes, seminars, etc.
- Annotated lists of publications (both in rhet/comp and other related fields).
- Annotated lists of creative publications/performances.

- Annotated lists of awards and grants received for scholarly or creative publication or presentation and ongoing scholarly projects.
- Annotated lists of editorial contributions to scholarly journals, creative publications, or edited collections.
- Annotated lists of events participated in or created, along with supporting documents.

b. Direct Evidence
- Flyers related to events created/participated in (with information about the nature of participation and context for events).
- Copies of publications, with additional context for less familiar publications.
- Copies of presentation slides/notes and handouts, with context for less familiar presentation venues.
- External articles/reviews that cite one's scholarly work.
- Citation/circulation analyses for published work.
- Correspondence related to reception of published work.
- Discussions of scholarly works in progress, including drafts, research protocols, IRB approvals, etc.
- Documents related to editorial review work for journals and other publications, including reader reports, reviews of submitted work, etc.
- Documents related to scholarly or creative editing of journals, magazines, or edited collections, including introductions, correspondence from press editors, annual reports, citation/circulation analyses, etc.
- Artifacts related to service work to the field: copies of journals or articles/essays reviewed/edited and reviews; artifacts that document the nature of that work: editing guidelines, workflow charts, annual reports, reviews of one's work; narrative descriptions.

Reappointment as Teaching Assistant Professor

Reappointment to a second three-year term as Teaching Assistant Professor is based on the candidate's having demonstrated sufficiently high quality in teaching, service, and scholarly engagement as to merit continuation toward promotion.

A. Degree and education
Candidates must have an MA, PhD, or MFA—already required for initial hiring.

B. Years of experience
Three (3) years of experience as a Teaching Assistant Professor or equivalent by the time of reappointment. These years can include years of equivalent teaching work elsewhere, as decided on a case-by-case basis at the time of initial appointment and included in the candidate's hiring letter.

C. Quality of teaching
Satisfactory performance as a teacher to date, with compelling evidence of continued development as a strong teacher, as demonstrated in satisfying at least four (4) of the above criteria, including at least one (1) from section A.

D. Quality of service
Satisfactory programmatic service, with compelling evidence of future development of substantive, strong service contributions. By service, we mean efforts beyond teaching that contribute to creating a robust, collaborative culture of writing across and/or beyond campus. This service should include activities spanning four (4) of the above types of work.

E. Quality of scholarly and related professional contributions (10%)
Aggregate, substantive contributions should include at least two (2) of the above kinds of scholarly and other activity, from any category.

Promotion to Teaching Associate Professor

Promotion to Teaching Associate Professor is based on demonstrating that candidates have successfully performed the responsibilities associated with all Writing Program faculty in teaching lines. Paramount, of course, is quality of teaching (at 60%); next, of professional service (most importantly service that advances the program's mission and vision but also that which serves the university and profession (30%)); and finally contributions to the discipline through presentation, publication, committee service, editing and judging and the like (10%). Successful candidates will show how their work in each area—and especially the broad areas of teaching—demonstrates quality across a range of criteria, with a clear promise that their accomplishments and contributions will grow as they continue in their role.

A. Degree and education
Candidates must have an MA, PhD, or MFA—already required for initial hiring.

B. Years of experience
Six (6) years of experience as a Teaching Assistant Professor or equivalent by the time of reappointment. These years can include years of equivalent teaching work elsewhere, as decided on a case-by-case basis at the time of initial appointment and included in the candidate's hiring and reappointment letters.

C. Quality of teaching
Excellent teaching shall be evaluated based on effective performance based on meeting six (6) of the above criteria, including at least one (1) from section A.

D. Quality of service (30%) Aggregate, substantive programmatic service should include activities spanning four (4) of the above types of work, from any category.

E. Quality of scholarly and other contributions (10%)
Aggregate, substantive contributions should include at least two (2) of the above kinds of scholarly and other activity, from any category.

Reappointment as Teaching Associate Professor

Candidates who have served for five (5) years as a Teaching Associate Professor must apply for either reappointment as a Teaching Associate Professor or promotion to Teaching Professor. Any candidate who applies for promotion to Teaching Professor will also be considered for

reappointment as a Teaching Associate Professor if that promotion is not granted. Under the current DU APT document, all candidates who apply for reappointment as a Teaching Associate Professor will also be considered for promotion to Teaching Professor.

For reappointment as a Teaching Associate Professor, candidates must follow the same procedures and meet the same requirements provided for promotion to that rank. For promotion to Teaching Professor, candidates must meet the requirements described below.

Promotion to Teaching Professor

This position represents a career achievement based on strong performance over time, with particular emphasis on accomplishments and growth demonstrated as a Teaching Associate Professor across the three areas of teaching, service, and scholarly contributions. Befitting the nature of the position, successful candidates will present exemplary depth and breadth in the areas of teaching (primary) and professional service; they will additionally demonstrate consistent engagement with the discipline of rhetoric/writing/composition studies, and many will also have strong performances in other areas affiliated with or adjacent to the discipline. There is promise of continued performance after promotion.

A. Degree and education

Generally, candidates are expected to hold a terminal degree, although absence of a terminal degree may be offset by a candidate who persuasively demonstrates leadership roles in advancing the program's mission and values, for example, by initiating and sustaining a program project that contributes substantially to that mission and its values; by initiating and sustaining a significant collaborative relationship within or outside the program that uniquely advances that mission and its values; or by contributing, individually or in collaboration, a significant pedagogical, scholarly, creative, or community-engaged work consistent with the program's mission and values.

B. Years of experience

Unless they decide to seek early promotion, candidates will have at least five years of experience at the rank of Teaching Associate Professor.

C. Quality of teaching

Promotion to Teaching Professor requires a consistent record of excellent performance as a teacher. Thus, the criteria for teaching add further considerations and requirements to those set out for earlier reappointment and promotion. Faculty eligible for promotion to this rank should demonstrate a combination of depth and breadth in multiple areas of teaching performance commensurate with the rank. Generally, they should address all the criteria listed in Teaching Section A, as well as their choice of four (4) from Section B. Candidates who choose to address fewer than all criteria from Teaching Section A must make a very compelling case about their strength as teachers and the breadth of that strength.

D. Quality of service (30%)

Promotion to Teaching Professor requires a consistent record of the kinds of professional service that advance the mission of the program. Candidates should demonstrate a combination of depth and breadth by explaining aggregate, substantive, and effective programmatic service. Generally, they should include activities spanning five (5) of the above types of work, from any category.

E. Quality of scholarly and related professional contributions (10%)
Consistent, ongoing, aggregate, substantive, effective programmatic contributions should include at least three (3) of the above kinds of scholarly and other activity, with at least one coming from publications/presentations. Candidates must also have a record of professional engagement with Rhetoric & Composition studies.

General Advice about Writing the Recommendation Letter

The letter the RPC writes is one of the most important items to be included in the candidate's portfolio. Besides observing proper decorum with an eye toward detail in proofreading, the RPC's recommendation letter should attempt to highlight outstanding details from the candidate's portfolio rather than just parroting the candidate's own cover letter. Further details about the letter follow:

- The letter should be concise: 2-3 pages (including signatures).
- The letter salutation should be "To whom it may concern."
- The letter should be written on DU Writing Program letterhead, either in digital form or printed.
- The audience for the letter is neither the candidate nor those who necessarily have an understanding of best writing instruction teaching practices. Avoid disciplinary jargon. In some cases, it can help this audience if you explain exemplary practices, particularly if the candidate does not in their portfolio. For this audience, highlight best practices in the field, significant service work aligned with writing studies, and the prestige of discipline-specific conferences and publications.
- Use specific examples from the candidate's materials; point to artifacts when possible, citing page or section numbers when available.
- Write one section of the letter on the candidate's teaching, one on service, and one on scholarship. The length of each section should be proportional to how it is weighted in our program expectations.
- The letter must explicitly state how the candidate has or has not met the criteria for reappointment and/or promotion.
- The first paragraph of the letter should describe the primary expectations of our position and our process, since each department's teaching professor line is different. Here is one example:

The University Writing Program's Reappointment and Promotion Committee recommends that [current rank and full name] be promoted/reappointed to [rank]. Following the Writing Program guidelines for review and promotion, [last name] provided the committee with a portfolio. Per the guidelines, she/he was required to include artifacts related to her/his teaching, service, and scholarship, as the review process aligns with the Writing Program's weighted categories: quality of teaching (60%), quality of service (30%), and quality of scholarship and other contributions (10%). Members of the Reappointment and Promotion Committee individually reviewed [title and last name's] portfolio before meeting to discuss and evaluate her/his performance and qualifications. We all agree that [last name] meets or exceeds expectations in each category.

Protocol for Third-Year Review Committees Offering Feedback to Candidates

Timing
Teaching Assistant Professors who have passed their third-year review may request feedback from their review committees once they have received formal notification that they have passed this review.

Candidates ideally should have a copy of their portfolio or draft artifacts in hand for concrete discussion during the review meeting. In cases where candidates have submitted paper portfolios, they might either have a second copy (electronic or paper), have drafts of relevant artifacts and narratives, or wait to receive their original portfolio back from the office of the Vice Chancellor for University Academic Programs.

Structure of Meeting
Once a candidate has requested feedback, the review committee will appoint one person to meet with the candidate. To the meeting, the candidate should bring materials and any specific questions; the appointed committee member will bring any notes from the rest of the committee.

Conversation during the meeting should focus on the candidate's representation of their work to date—as opposed to the work itself. Committee members may, for example, comment on the narrative, the artifacts, the relationship of narrative to artifacts, how the candidate frames or makes arguments about various aspects of their work, and so on. However, comments about the candidate's performance in general are best directed to the candidate's mentoring group and to conversations with the Executive Director.

Writing Program Peer Mentoring Structure
Overview
Every teaching-line faculty member is invited to opt in to a peer mentoring group whose main purpose is to provide ongoing mutual support to colleagues as they navigate annual reviews and reappointment and promotion processes.

Group Composition
Groups ideally will include 3-4 people, in part to ensure a triangulation (or quadrangulation) of perspective. Ideally, groups will include both faculty who have been with the Writing Program since its founding and newer faculty. Steering will send out a form for people to indicate what they might want most out of their group: Do you primarily want to give or receive advice? Do you want to have informal conversations with colleagues about your experiences? Do you want to workshop materials for reviews? Steering will then identify groups and inform all participating faculty by the end of May.

Coordinators
Each group will choose a coordinator, whose main responsibilities are
* to convene groups at least once per quarter, more often if the group wishes;
* to ensure that each group member is given equal time and attention in meetings;

- and to pass along some valued practices in mentoring to Steering at the end of the first year. Steering will then compile and share these practices.

Coordinators will meet this quarter to identify potential resources, generate questions that they might take their groups, and anticipate challenges or opportunities going forward. It might be useful for this group to set some discussion norms so that there is a shared, program-wide ethos across groups. Each coordinator will then convene their group for the first time no later than June 2019.

Meetings
Groups should meet at least once per quarter, in a neutral location (not someone's home). Group members are encouraged to prepare for these meetings by generating specific questions and challenges they wish to discuss.

Meetings might take any number of forms. For example, one group might adopt the structure and conversational norms of DU's peer-to-peer conversations. In this model, one person's questions and concerns take center stage, with other attendees responding to those questions and concerns in descriptive ways, without offering advice or using "should" language.

Alternately, groups might choose in a given meeting to focus on a particular question (How can we best represent our service in reappointment and promotional materials? How might I write about my teaching for a SOTL article?) or issue (work-life balance, career anxiety).

Alternately again, groups might choose to use their time to workshop articles, teaching materials, or their portfolios.

Within groups, more senior faculty might be particularly attentive to identifying opportunities on campus and relevant institutional memory that might be useful to newer faculty members.

Extensions of Meetings
Groups are free to decide to include other forms of engagement, perhaps with an eye for helping one another to document and celebrate their work. For example, members might choose to observe one another's classrooms, to collaborate on a workshop or event for the purpose of being able to write about one another's service or inter-categorical work, and so on.

Outcomes
Groups are free to decide whether and how they wish to document their work. Some groups may choose to write letters of support for one another or to create another kind of artifact that documents their work. Other groups may decide that collegiality, mutual support, and informed perspectives and guidance are themselves the outcomes.

Teaching in the Writing Program

Courses, goals, features, and assessment

T**he Writing Program teaches** a variety of courses to help students develop complex writing abilities needed in contemporary academic, professional, and civic life. The program accomplishes this primarily through the First-Year Writing Sequence—WRIT 1122 & 1133 (or the Honors variant 1622 & 1633/1733), which all new and transfer students are required to take unless exempted by AP or transfer credit. The Writing Program has also developed a multidisciplinary Minor in Writing Practices described in the Writing Minor section below.

Courses & Goals

WRIT 1122: Rhetoric and Academic Writing
WRIT 1122 teaches strategies that are vital in writing for well-educated readers, primarily in situations that require students to present and justify positions. The course teaches rhetorical analysis and practices, the effective use of readings and source materials, and techniques for generating, revising, and editing texts produced to meet specific situations. WRIT 1122 provides sustained practice in writing, with systematic instructor feedback, that results in at least four finished and polished papers, totaling some 20-25 pages by quarter's end. Students will additionally complete several informal or drafting exercises.

Course Goals
Students will:
- Demonstrate practical knowledge of the concept "rhetorical situation," through the abilities both to analyze and to write effectively in different kinds of situations.
- Demonstrate proficiency with basic elements of rhetorical analysis (such as logos, ethos, and pathos) in a range of texts, and the application of that facility in their own writing.
- Demonstrate the ability to produce writing that effectively provides evidence and reasoning for assertions, for audiences of educated readers.
- Demonstrate the ability to incorporate and attribute or document source material in rhetorically effective ways.
- Demonstrate the ability to use feedback to revise their own writing and the ability to provide useful feedback to others.

- Demonstrate the ability to edit and proofread their writing.

Elaboration of the Goals for WRIT 1122: Notes to faculty

1. *Demonstrate practical knowledge of the concept "rhetorical situation," through the abilities both to analyze and to write effectively in different kinds of situations.*
   A rhetorical situation has a purpose, an intended readership, and a writer. Situations arise in contexts, which leads readers to have expectations to which writers should attend. These expectations vary by context and change over time. No single course can teach students to be effective in every possible rhetorical situation. However, a course can—and should—teach students the need to adjust to different situations, and students should demonstrate their practical grasp of that concept by producing pieces of writing that adapt successfully to varied rhetorical situations.

2. *Demonstrate proficiency with basic elements of rhetorical analysis in a range of texts, and the application of that facility in their own writing.*
   Teachers of WRIT 1133 will expect students to come to their classes having some experience with rhetorical analysis as well as with terms such as exigence, genre, style, audience, and the classical appeals (*logos*, *ethos* and *pathos*). As a result, students completing 1122 should be able to discuss and write meaningful things about strategies that other writers have employed in particular rhetorical situations (both what and why), and they should be able to point out the advantages, weaknesses, and limitations of their own choices in their own writing. Of course, there are many layers and complexities for each of those terms, developed across centuries of rhetorical theory. The point is not to bury students (or teachers) in all the nuances and complexity of rhetoric, although some teachers may choose to include more than others. The point is to give them some theoretical knowledge (and associated techniques) and the opportunity to practice it as a useful, transferable ability.

3. *Demonstrate the ability to produce writing that provides evidence and reasoning for assertions in ways that will be effective for audiences of educated readers.*
   While 1122 broadly teaches rhetorical analysis, it privileges logical reasoning, for two reasons. Logical reasoning is privileged in academic writing (the practical reason), and civic society would be better served by discourses in which claims were supported with evidence and reasoning (the ethical and idealistic reason). As a result, a substantial amount of writing for the course should be for "educated" (even idealized) readers who challenge writers to use evidence and reasoning well.

4. *Demonstrate the ability to incorporate and attribute or document source material in rhetorically effective ways.*
   Students in WRIT 1122 should come to understand the rhetorical uses of sources—to enhance ethos, to add support, to generate contrasting ideas, etc.—as well as the ethical uses of sources in the context of academic and scholarly writing. Effective rhetorical use of sources also includes incorporating quotations effectively and providing clear in-text attributions for public and professional writing (in their academic writing, following conventions for in-text citation and bibliographic pages). The emphasis in 1122 is on using sources (summarizing, paraphrasing, critiquing, synthesizing) rather than finding sources. As a result, teachers may find it most productive to have students work with "given" readings—and with one or two source materials—rather than on extensive "found" sources.

5. *Demonstrate the ability to use feedback to revise their own writing and the ability to provide useful feedback to others.*
   As the features of 1122 and 1133 make clear, all elements of composing are important. This goal emphasizes revision as a key ability to be developed and demonstrated in the course. Revisions are changes to a text that would change the summary (or propositional content) of that text. Because much writing and revision happens collaboratively, it's also important that students develop abilities to give productive help to others and abilities to attend to comments and suggestions given by others.

6. *Demonstrate the ability to edit and proofread their writing.*
   Texts that have errors in word choice, spelling, grammar, conventional usage, or punctuation significantly compromise the ethos of their writers and may even cloud meaning. Texts whose style, voice, or register is inappropriate to the rhetorical situation at hand also compromise ethos and understanding. Students need to show that they can use methods that will help them create effectively stated, well-edited, and proofed texts.

WRIT 1133: Writing and Research
This course builds on the writing and rhetorical skills learned in WRIT 1122 by shifting attention from general rhetorical strategies to specific rhetorical strategies that shape different kinds of academic inquiry. Through introduction to quantitative, qualitative, and textual research traditions, students identify how written reasoning varies in terms of the questions posed, the kind of evidence used to answer them, and the nature of the audience or forum for the result. In addition, the course teaches how to shape research into substantive academic arguments, with attention to the ethical consequences of their rhetorical choices. Students are asked to develop further their linguistic, design, and reasoning competencies, with added consideration of citation conventions. Students complete at least 20 pages of revised and polished writing, in multiple assignments, as well as numerous additional exercises, in projects requiring library-based research as well as other types. Final portfolio. Prerequisite: WRIT 1122.

Course Goals
In addition to continuing to master the goals of WRIT 1122, students will:
- Demonstrate practical knowledge of academic research traditions (for example, text-based/interpretive; measurement-based/empirical; and observational/qualitative) through effectively writing in at least two of those traditions.
- Demonstrate an understanding of rhetorical/conventional differences among various academic disciplines or groups of disciplines.
- Demonstrate practical knowledge of rhetorical differences between writing for academic audiences and writing for popular audiences, through both analysis and performance.
- Demonstrate proficiency in finding, evaluating, synthesizing, critiquing, and documenting published sources appropriate to given rhetorical situations.

Elaboration of the Goals for WRIT 1133: Notes to faculty

1. *Demonstrate practical knowledge of academic research traditions (for example, text-based/interpretive; measurement-based/empirical; and observational/qualitative) through effectively writing in at least two of those traditions.*
   Research is central to WRIT 1133, but research understood broadly. The university houses several research traditions. There is a close relationship between rhetoric and epistemology, the ways that writers make knowledge differently in different traditions, including such matters as what counts as evidence and what form an argument should take.

   One such tradition is reading-based research, in which the writer assembles a set of written texts and, through complex practices of interpretation, analysis, and synthesis, develops an argument based on what the writer has read. For most students, in most writing courses, this is what research means. It is the primary method of the humanities, and it is a component of most other disciplinary methods.

   However, it is hardly the only research tradition that matters in the university. A related tradition is the interpretive, in which the artifacts aren't print texts but, rather, art or music, images, architecture, and the whole gamut of culture artifacts.

   Another research tradition is qualitative research, in which the writer uses systematic observational or first-hand inquiry strategies to generate descriptions of phenomena, then interprets those descriptions to support arguments. Methods include interview and direct observation.

   Yet another common tradition is measurement-based research, in which the writer uses a systematic procedure to generate a quantitative representation of a phenomenon, then makes an argument based on that representation. The phenomena are physical in the natural sciences, and the measures come through instruments such as scales or rulers or dosimeters or spectrometers or so on. The phenomena are social or psychological in the social sciences, and the measures come through instruments such as surveys or coded discourse.

   Students in WRIT 1133 should come to appreciate the diversity of research traditions and should produce writings that apply a variety of research methods.

2. *Demonstrate an understanding of rhetorical/conventional differences among various academic disciplines or groups of disciplines.*
   The emphasis of this goal is "understanding of differences" and not "mastery of specific disciplines." The latter, of course, would be impractical for WRIT 1133 and is properly the responsibility of individual departments and disciplines.

   The goal is not inoculation against all error or mastery of the writing styles of many disciplines but, rather, the ability to analyze and learn to emulate varied disciplinary discourse, with the help of future teachers of such discourse in future courses. "Academic discourse" is hardly a unified entity, and students benefit from knowing that the concept of "rhetorical situations" learned in 1122 applies within the academy as well as without. Clearly this goal maps closely against goal one. That is, the adherence to certain epistemologies in certain disciplines often manifests itself in patterns of organization and development, citation practices (and the values

underlying them), the ethos of writers, and so on. However, a research method isn't manifested only in disciplinary discourses. A lot of popular writing uses interview or observation, for example, or gathering and interpreting artifacts (think of essays on film genres). One can "demonstrate an understanding" both through analysis and through performance, and teachers will likely find both useful in teaching this goal. As with any of these goals, teachers may elect to have students write short papers or parts of papers or do exercises with voice and style, rather than only writing fully-fledged papers.

3. *Demonstrate practical knowledge of rhetorical differences between writing for academic audiences and writing for popular audiences, through both analysis and performance.*
There are significant differences between writing for academic audiences and writing for popular audiences. The most obvious is a depth of knowledge or expertise between the two groups of readers. However, another important difference is that academic audiences are usually obliged to read texts to keep up with their professions, while popular audiences elect to read—or not read—based on a broader range of considerations including enjoyment and identity. This difference has implications for style, manner of presentation, and the design of the texts. Students in 1133 should recognize and understand the differences between writing to an audience of disciplinary experts reading for professional reasons and writing to an audience of nonexperts reading for civic or aesthetic reasons. One way to develop that knowledge experientially is to have students "translate" pieces written for one type of audience into pieces intended for the other.

4. *Demonstrate proficiency in finding, evaluating, synthesizing, critiquing, and documenting published sources appropriate to given rhetorical situations.*
While we value multiple kinds of research in 1133, writing with reading is vital. In 1133 (over 1122) we add an emphasis on finding the readings that writers will use. Students should learn to use academic databases and develop strategies for finding information for specific rhetorical needs. Research needs to be understood as a purposeful act, with sources sought and used to address specific writing needs rather than as a hollow formal act of gathering and dumping.

Features of Both WRIT 1122 and 1133

1. **Producing texts**. Focus on having students produce texts. The feature that most distinguishes writing courses from, say, other classes that may include written assignments is the former's sustained emphasis on student writing. The student's texts are the primary focus of the course, receiving as much respect as expert texts—and more time and attention. The focus can be seen in several practices, including explicit instruction on writing strategies and processes; sharing student writing with others in the course; peer workshops; writing center consultations; individual conferences with the professor, and so on. While students do engage readings, they do so primarily in order to improve their own writing and their critical/analytical facilities. Students will have an opportunity to write for different purposes and audiences, with the goal of developing tools they need to communicate effectively in various academic and civic contexts.

2. **Rhetorical and critical analysis**. Include specific instruction in rhetorical and critical analysis. Rhetorical and critical analysis helps students become more astute readers, analysts,

and critics of published texts, focusing on how and why writers achieve effects on readers. Students will learn how texts vary in both form and content according to their intended audiences, their purposes, and the contexts in which they were written. Students will learn to read a text closely and write about the way it functions, not just what it contains. They will also learn to evaluate claims, evidence, and reasoning strategies, as well as ethical and emotional appeals that complement these logical elements. WRIT 1122 focuses on basic strategies for rhetorical and critical analysis, primarily in popular and civic discourses. WRIT 1133 emphasizes how these skills function within the contexts of research and disciplinary traditions, including in relation to more popular writings about academic knowledge.

3. **Rhetorical strategies**. Include specific instruction and practice in using rhetorical strategies. The emphasis on using rhetorical strategies complements instruction in rhetorical and critical analysis. The shift in emphasis is from analyzing what others have done (and with what effect, and why) to using those strategies in students' own writings. Writers face a host of decisions as they plan, organize, and compose texts. They must persuade audiences situated within a certain historical time and cultural place, limited by certain constraints: time, money, logistics, etc. Vital to navigating this maze of choices is understanding the particulars of the rhetorical situation. What does my audience know or believe, and what implications does that have for me as a writer? What evidence and reasoning will be most effective? What tone should I adopt, and how should I present myself? What organizational strategies are most effective in this given situation? How do I best deal with points of view different from my own?

4. **Suitable audiences**. Emphasize writing for well-educated audiences, generally for public/civic purposes (1122) and academic audiences (1133). In the finite time of a single course, it's clearly impossible to give students practice in every genre and situation they will encounter. For example, writing to people with a high school education who may do fairly little reading may invoke strategies significantly different from writing to college graduates who regularly read *Wired* or *Harpers*. Similarly, there are important differences between writing in professional/workplace situations, writing for personal development and pleasure, writing in specific academic disciplines, and writing on subject matters, issues, and ideas for a broader reading public. This latter falls under writing for civic purposes—that is, writing that seeks inform and influence thought and decision-making in various public spheres.

5. **Writing processes**. Substantially use process pedagogies, including regular attention to invention, production, revision, editing, and design; responses to multiple drafts and works in progress; and so on. Good writing does not occur magically.
- Process pedagogies recognize that strong writing skills develop over time through practice. Rather than focus solely on the finished product (e.g. the final exam; the one-time graded paper; the longer research paper), process pedagogies guide students through various aspects of writing, from invention to drafting to revision. A key feature of process pedagogies is providing feedback to students during the process. These may include small group feedback sessions, teacher-student conferences, comments on drafts, and in-class workshops.
- Invention is the act of generating ideas and content or discovering new directions that writing might take. Invention strategies may include systematic inquiry heuristics, free-writing, journaling, preliminary research, outlining, and questioning, along with classroom collaboration and discussion. Through invention, students discover both what they already

know about their subject and what they need to know.

- Drafting is the fundamental process of getting words down on the page or screen in a productive order informed by purpose, audience, and context when producing any document.

- Revision involves considering the fit between a developing text and the rhetorical situation for which it's being produced. Revision attends to substantive issues, including overall structure, argument, logic, purpose, and uses of evidence. Based on their self-analysis and feedback from instructors and peers, students doing revision work make additions, subtractions, transpositions, and substitutions to their texts, at levels ranging from sentence and paragraphs to ideas and sequences.

- Design means attending to the physical features of the text as it is delivered to its audience. At one level, design includes features such as typefaces, margins, and spacing. At another level, it includes the incorporation of visual elements (images, tables) and document layout. At still another level, it may include multimedia or digital texts, perhaps even including sound or video.

- Editing means attending to surface-level features of texts to make them conform to readers' expectations of style, grammar and usage, manuscript conventions, and so on. Editing involves both proofreading and focusing on textual features as small as words, phrases, and sentences to promote not only correctness but also precision and rhetorical effectiveness. See #8, below.

6. **Reading**. Include a reading component. Reading in WRIT 1122 and 1133 is important both for practice in rhetorical analysis and for providing content for students to write about, with, through, and against. Through active reading, students come into conversation with texts by others, analyzing received positions and arriving at their own. Students need to be able to summarize readings, interpret their meanings and implications, analyze their rhetorical strategies, relate them to other texts about the same subject matter, and explain their limitations or inadequacies. To practice these skills, students in WRIT 1122 and 1133 may read a text or set of related texts; discuss them (unpacking the meanings, debate the terms used, arriving at an interpretation); write in response; synthesize multiple readings; produce critiques or reviews; and use summary, paraphrase, or quotation to incorporate ideas into their own texts. Reading of student writing in the course is also important, using all the strategies one might use for published writing.

7. **Source documentation**. Teach basic techniques for incorporating and documenting sources. In WRIT 1122, students will begin to develop an awareness of, and comfort with using, sources in their writing. The course will focus primarily on working with sources rather than finding them, and it will concentrate on dealing effectively with a limited number of sources rather than an extensive list of them. This approach will include learning how to summarize accurately, paraphrase key ideas, and quote or cite specific ideas or information concisely, accurately, and in ways that blend source materials effectively with students' own writing. Students will consider pertinent questions. For example: Why draw on sources? What types of sources will best support particular arguments or rhetorical situations? How do writers evaluate sources, attending to such things as the author's credentials and quality of reasoning and evidence, the timeliness of the research, its intended readership, and so on?

Students will gain basic experience in documenting sources appropriately according to MLA and at least either APA or the Chicago Manual of Style. The goal is not to have students master all conventions of all style manuals but to teach them how to use style manuals and to understand the vital importance of following conventions to document sources aptly. Students in WRIT 1133 will emphasize, additionally, finding and evaluating sources.

8. **Editing and proofreading**. Teach students editing and proofreading strategies in order to produce texts that meet the grammar, usage, and delivery expectations of their readers. Students should learn that careful attention to editing and proofreading strengthens their ability to be taken seriously by their readers. At the same time, students learn that the absence of sentence-level errors does not necessarily mean that the writing is effective. Students should learn strategies for editing and proofreading in the context of their own writing, rather than through generalized grammar exercises. Based on need, instructors may devote small amounts of class time to particular issues in style, or to grammar, punctuation, and usage errors.

Editing is understood as having both an emphasis on style (e.g., word choice, diction, emphasis, transition, gracefulness) and on managing errors in grammar, punctuation, and usage.

Editing for style: As time allows, concepts about editing as stylistic craft are introduced, with reference to course readings for positive models. Though students may not be ready for more sophisticated stylistic editing, they will benefit from introductory instruction on word choice, sentence structure, and other stylistic elements that can be used to enhance meaning.

Editing as error management: Students learn to make distinctions within a continuum of concerns—between higher order and lower order writing errors. They learn to identify their own patterns of error and develop a variety of strategies for addressing and correcting these patterns. Students develop long-term skills for self-diagnosis of error and successful use of available resources, including use of a handbook and familiarity with the Writing Center. As students become proficient in self-diagnosis, explicit emphasis is placed on high-order errors, such as sentence-boundary confusion, that block readers from understanding the text.

Proofreading is a last step to ensure that the text is as free as possible from errors or unintentional elements. Students learn strategies for catching typographical errors, inconsistencies in spelling, and other purely surface-level mistakes that irritate readers and affect the author's ethos. Because research indicates the inefficacy of marking all errors in a piece of writing as a means of teaching mechanical proficiency, instructor marking and evaluation of editing and proofreading errors should be constructive and instructive, not punitive. Student writing is not expected to be error-free by the end of WRIT 1122, but by the end of the course students should be able to distinguish different categories of error and be able to identify their individual error patterns. They should have developed strategies for addressing these error patterns, and they should be aware of the some of the resources available to them for strengthening their writing at the levels of style, grammar, usage, and punctuation.

9. **Substantial production**. Require students to produce from 6000 to 8000 revised and polished words (20-25 pages), in at least four texts. Just as musicians and athletes learn by practicing—by "doing" rather than by "studying about"—so do writers develop by writing. Students can generally expect many writing assignments, some of them single-drafted (even informal exercises), others more formal papers multiply drafted and revised. As four-credit courses, WRIT courses should have students complete 8 to 12 hours of out-of-class work each week, the bulk of it their own writing. Students will generally write several thousand words, in as few as four to as many as twenty individual writing assignments. Of that total volume produced, students will complete a least four "finished and polished" pieces, together totaling 6000-8000 words. By "finished and polished," we mean writing that is thoroughly revised and carefully edited, usually based on responses from the instructor (and peers), and that represents the student's best work in given rhetorical situations.

10. **Staged learning experiences**. Accomplish the course goals through a well-conceived sequence of activities and assignments. A commitment to the process of writing, which is at the heart of our pedagogies, informs the design of both courses; each section provides a careful sequence of reading and writing assignments designed to build student skills and abilities. Sequences of writing activities, for example, will equip students with the rhetorical skills to use in future or longer assignments. The cumulative sequence of assignments means that students continually draw upon what they have learned already in order to push themselves even further. Our goal is not only to provide students with a repertoire of writing tactics but also to teach them how to combine those tactics into coherent, purposeful, and context-specific strategies.

11. **Final portfolios**. Require a brief final portfolio, at a minimum meeting the requirements for assessment portfolios, as described below in the section on Assessment in WRIT. Consider having students also prepare more complete portfolios reflecting the full range of course objectives.

WRIT 1622/1633 and 1733

WRIT 1622: Advanced Writing Seminar I
A writing course for advanced first-year students, emphasizing rhetorical strategies for different academic and civic audiences and purposes; critical reading and analysis; and research. Course sections focus on a coherent set of texts, usually on an issue or theme.

Prerequisite: One of the following: admission to Honors Program; score of three (3) or better on AP Language and Composition or Literature and Composition exams; score of four (4) on an IB English exam; or permission of the Executive Director.

WRIT 1633: Advanced Writing Seminar II
A continuation of WRIT 1622, this is a writing course for advanced first-year students, emphasizing rhetoric strategies for different academic and civic audiences and purposes; critical reading and analysis; and research. The course has a significant research component. Course sections focus on a coherent set of texts, usually on an issue or theme.

Prerequisite: WRIT 1122 or 1622, plus one of the following: admission to the Honors Program; score of three (3) or better on the AP Language and Composition or Literature and Composition exams; score of four (4) on an IB English exam; or permission of the Executive Director.

WRIT 1733: Honors Writing
Honors Writing is designed for students who will benefit from a particularly rigorous and in-depth experience with language. This class offers a theme around which students read serious and challenging texts and write at least 25 pages of polished prose, with additional less formal writings. The course offers advanced instruction in rhetorical theory and practice, as well as writing in multiple research traditions in the academy. This class uses a highly participatory discussion format, and students will have latitude in choosing and directing much of their work. Topics vary from section to section.

Prerequisite: Admission to the Honors Program and either WRIT 1622 or 1122 (or equivalent credit from AP, IB, or transfer); or permission of the Executive Director, in consultation with the director of Honors.

Writing Program Advising
AP/IB Student WRIT Placement.
Students may receive credit for WRIT 1122 if they receive:
- A score of 4 or 5 on the AP English Language and Composition exam
- A score of 5, 6, or 7 on an IB English exam

Students must still complete WRIT 1133 or 1633; or, if they are in the Honors Program, WRIT 1733.

Students with the following scores do **not** receive credit for WRIT 1122, but they may elect to take WRIT 1622 as a more challenging alternative.
- A score of 3 on the AP English Language and Composition exam
- A score of 3 or 4 on the AP English Literature and Composition Exam
- A score of 4 on an IB English exam

Transfer Students. Students who complete an appropriate writing course at an accredited institution may receive transfer credit for WRIT 1122 or WRIT 1133. The Writing Program may need to review the course to make sure that it is equivalent. Students may apply for transfer credit through the Admission and Transfer Coordinator in the Office of the Registrar at DU. The Registrar's Admission and Transfer Coordinator will determine whether the course meets basic requirements to be accepted for credit at DU. If the course does, it will initially be entered as "elective" credit. The Registrar's Coordinator will next see if the course is part of the State of Colorado's guaranteed transfer program, GT Pathways.

The Colorado courses that transfer as WRIT 1122 can be found at:
http://highered.colorado.gov/Academics/Transfers/gtPathways/Curriculum/co1.html

Courses that will transfer as WRIT 1133 can be found at:
http://highered.colorado.gov/Academics/Transfers/gtPathways/Curriculum/co2.html

The Registrar's Coordinator may be unable to determine if some courses are equivalent to DU courses. In those cases, it's the student's responsibility to provide detailed information to the Writing Program that will help us evaluate the course as an equivalent for DU's courses.

In the case of uncertainty, the student should furnish the following information to the Writing Program in an email with attachments to writing@du.edu.
1. Student name, Banner ID, and campus email address.
2. Specific request (e.g. "Please consider course X taken at school Y as equivalent to WRIT 1122 (or 1133) at DU.").
3. The course number, title, catalog description, name of institution, and quarter/semester taken.
4. A full description of the course, including the textbooks, the course goals and specific writing techniques/concepts/strategies/principles covered in the course, the specific course assignments, and a description of the instructor's teaching practices (for example, reading multiple drafts, peer response, conferences, and so on). Many (or perhaps even all) of these elements may be in the course syllabus. Some will be clear from the textbooks. Others students may have to provide in additional descriptions.
5. Additionally, student may provide a portfolio of writing in the proposed course. This portfolio is optional, but showing a collection of work written for the class can strengthen the case.

Assessment in WRIT

The Writing Program assesses student learning, the quality of writing, and writing instruction in the WRIT sequence. The assessment has evolved since the program's beginning, but it has always consisted of analysis of student writing and of reflection. Assessment leads to discussions of our varied teaching approaches in faculty meetings. Currently, our assessment consists of two portfolios, one for xx22 and one for xx33.

Both kinds of portfolios are uploaded as a single word processed document with an option for extra artifacts that might include video, image, or sound files. Currently, portfolios are uploaded in the Canvas course management system, according to instructions delivered each quarter by the Assistant Director. A random sample (10% – 20%) of the portfolios are assessed during the first few weeks of summer, and the results are reported to the faculty in the fall. The portfolios are maintained by the program for a limited time and are available for additional internal research projects and initiatives to improve teaching.

In Winter WRIT xx22, the student portfolio consists of an introduction essay and two selections from xx22. The 2-3 page introduction essay discusses how the student rhetorically analyzed the works of others and/or produced rhetorical works of their own.

In Spring WRIT xx33, the student portfolio can take one of three forms based on faculty preference. The first is an introductory essay that makes a case for how the student met the course goals, including 3 selections by the student. The second option is a reflective essay that focuses on learning and the process of achieving the course goals, also including 3 selections by

the student. The final option is for faculty members to create their own portfolio assignments. The selection for each option should take place within the first few weeks of the term. The course goals we currently use for xx33 assessment are as follows:

a. Demonstrate practical knowledge of academic research traditions (for example, text-based/interpretive; measurement-based/empirical; and observational/qualitative) through effectively writing in at least two of those traditions.

b. Demonstrate practical knowledge of rhetorical differences between writing for academic audiences and writing for popular audiences, through both analysis and performance.

c. Demonstrate proficiency in finding, evaluating, synthesizing, critiquing, and documenting published sources appropriate to given rhetorical situations.

Minor in Writing Practices

The Minor in Writing Practices develops writing proficiencies and knowledge at a time when employers assert that writing abilities are paramount, when writing shapes civic thought and action, when writing is a means of personal development and social interaction, and when writing is inflected by evolving technologies. The minor is open to all undergraduates who have successfully completed WRIT xx22 and xx33 and are interested in honing their writing, furthering their understanding of concepts and theories, and demonstrating their abilities to employers and others. Students will complete at least 20 credits of courses culminating in a formal portfolio of their work.

Requirements for the Minor
- WRIT 2000: Theories of Writing (4 credits)
- Two courses from a list of approved Applied Writing courses (8 credits)
- One course from a list of approved Theory, History, or Research in Writing courses (4 credits)
- WRIT 3500: Capstone: Writing Design and Circulation (4 credits)
- Students select approved courses from several departments and programs, including Writing; English; Media, Film, and Journalism Studies; Communication Studies; Theater; Business; and Anthropology. These multiple sites offer flexibility and breadth. That said, the minor can be completed entirely from WRIT offerings alone.

Introduction		Credits
WRIT 2000	Introduction to Theories of Writing	4
Theory, History, Research in Writing (minimum 4)		
ANTH 2020	Artifacts, Texts, Meaning	4
ANTH 3060	Cultural Narratives	4
COMN 2150	Rhetorical/Critical Communication	4
COMN 2300	Fundamentals of Argumentation	4
COMN 2400	Landmarks in Rhetorical Theory	4
EDPX 2200	Cultures in Emergent Digital Practices	4
MFJS 2100	Culture, Media, and Power	4
ENGL 2815	Rhetorical Principles	4
ENGL 3815	Studies in Rhetoric	4
ENGL 3817	History of Rhetoric	4
ENGL 3818	Composition Theory	4
WRIT 2500	Topics in Writing Theory and Research	4
Applied Writing (minimum 8 credits, from list)		
BUS 3500	Business Communications I	4
ENGL 1000	Introduction to Creative Writing	4
ENGL 2001/2002/2012	Creative Writing—Poetry	4
ENGL 2010/2011/2012	Creative Writing—Fiction	4
ENGL 2021	Business Technical Writing	4
ENGL 2040	Intro to Publishing	4
ENGL 3015	Advanced Creative Writing: Non-fiction	4
ENGL 3021	Professional Writing	4
MFJS 2140	Newswriting and Reporting	4
THEA 3711	Playwriting	4
WRIT 2040	Memoir and Personal Writing	4
WRIT 2050	Rhetorical Grammar	2-4
WRIT 2600	Topics in Applied Writing	2-4
Capstone (4 credits)		
WRIT 3500*	Writing Design and Circulation	4

*As a capstone experience, WRIT 3500 has prerequisites of successfully completing WRIT 2000 and completing other minor requirements. See the complete description below.

Other WRIT Courses

WRIT 2000: Theories of Writing. This course introduces a number of theories of writing, providing an overview of complex issues and research into the state and status of writing and writers. It takes up such questions as these: What is writing? Where did it come from? How did it develop—and did it do so the same or differently in other cultures? How do writers develop—and what accounts for differences? What are different types of writing, different situations for writing, different tools and practices—and how do these interconnect? What does it mean to study writing? How have major figures theorized writing, and what tensions emerge among their theories? What are relationships among thought, speech, and writing—and among images, film/video, and sound? How do such theories change our notions of what texts are and what

texts do? Students will learn how various theorists, historians, and researchers answer these questions, and they will apply that knowledge to their own projects.
Prerequisite: WRIT 1133.

WRIT 2040: Memoir and Personal Writing. In learning to write memoir, a writer is learning how to analyze memory, select experiences, invent narratives—all while still being "truthful." In this course, students distinguish memoir from other forms of writing about the self, including autobiography, diaries, journals, blogs, and letters. They read excerpts of published memoirs and drafts of memoirs they write during the course, with a particular interest in how these writers shape and represent their experiences textually. How do people construct the stories they tell about their lives? What is the value of personal writing for writers and readers? And perhaps most importantly, how can we begin to create stories of experiences in compelling ways? Students will complete multiple writing projects, including at least one polished short memoir.

WRIT 2050: Style and Rhetorical Grammar. Be concise. Don't split infinitives. Write with flow. Don't end a sentence with a preposition. Avoid the passive voice. Never use "I" in academic writing. Everyone has these maxims about writing and grammar. This course will interrogate those maxims and provide systematic ways to draft, revise, and polish prose based on the needs and demands of the audience. More specifically, students consider matters of sentence structure and sentence rhythm, cohesion and concision, as well as voice and point of view. Through a series of shorter and longer writing assignments, in-class exercises and activities, and course readings, students hone their writing and grammar skills, all with the goal of writing with improved clarity and grace. The course is open to all students who want to take their writing to a next level of sophistication, clarity, and range.
Prerequisite: WRIT 1122 or permission of instructor.

WRIT 2702: Topics in Writing Theory. This course provides curricular space for various subjects and foci related to theories about writing, histories of writing and its status and development, or research about writing. Specific offerings of the course will vary according to professor or student needs, interests, and opportunities, and to developing knowledge and research in the field.

Examples of possible topics might include multimodality and writing, relationships between visual and verbal rhetoric, the development of specific genres over time, the relationships between academic and civic writing, the history of writing in specific schools or settings, research into the acquisition of writing skills, social policies and practices that affect writing, ethical issues in writing practices, the effects of technologies on writing, and so on. The preceding list is illustrative, not exclusive.
Prerequisite: WRIT 1133 or permission of the Executive Director.

WRIT 2701: Topics in Applied Writing. Individual offerings of this topics course teach skills and strategies for writing in a specific professional or public context or for improving in a specific type of writing. The focus is on the texts, genres, conventions, habits, and critical questions salient to writers in a given situation. Each offering will focus on a topic not available in existing courses. Possible examples include: "Writing for the Public Good"; "Publications Editing"; "Writing, Curation, and the Archive"; "Writing (in) the Workplace"; "Writing Profiles and Biographies";

"Nature Writing"; and so on. (The previous list is merely suggestive.) Befitting the course, the primary writing focus will be on producing texts for/within the topical focus, with emphasis on drafting, revision, and design. Students will also write responses to and analyses of assigned readings (including the work of other students).
Prerequisite: WRIT 1133 or permission of the Executive Director.

WRIT 3500: Capstone: Writing Design and Circulation. The primary goal of this capstone course for the Minor in Writing Practices is to create and present a professional electronic/web-based portfolio synthesizing university writing experiences. The portfolio showcases and offers reflective insight into a student's writings, demonstrating the writer's ability to navigate diverse rhetorical situations. Students will learn theories and practices for selecting, arranging, and circulating/publishing written work, culminating in a required portfolio that synthesizes their university writing experiences. In addition to practicing principles of editing and design, students will produce a substantive revision of a previous piece of their own writing and compose a theory of writing that synthesizes analyses of their practices with published scholarship and research. The course covers design considerations and strategies and offers studio time for peer and instructor feedback. It culminates with a public showcase.
Prerequisites: WRIT 2500 and completion of at least two other courses in the Minor in Writing Practices.

Hybrid Sections. Beginning in Winter 2011, the Writing Program began to offer specifically designated "Hybrid" sections of WRIT 1122 that combined face-to-face and online instruction. Instructors of these special courses typically met with students in the classroom once a week for the usual 110 minutes, then later provided online instruction materials and assignments for students as an alternative to a second weekly meeting.

The idea for the Hybrid Course developed out of a small lecturer initiative from Fall 2009, created to address the persistent issue of excessive (i.e., three or more) student absences related to university activities, such as varsity sports and the performances, rehearsals, and auditions of music majors. This absenteeism has been especially problematic during winter quarters because the heavy travel schedules of DU's ski and basketball teams can result in a few dozen students missing six or more WRIT classes. After meeting with athletic advisors and music school faculty, members of the original initiative group determined this problem could not be solved simply with better advising because of the limited scheduling flexibility students in each group have. As a result, the initiative members proposed that the Writing Program should consider creating a course designed to minimize the impact of the travel and performance schedules of these groups of students. The Hybrid Course was designed to meet those needs.

To reduce the possibility that a student would sign up for one of the Hybrid sections without realizing it, each section was specifically identified in the online course description as a Hybrid Course that would have fewer face-to-face meetings with the instructor. Each Hybrid Course description also listed the dates of every face-to-face meeting of the quarter so students could choose the section that best fit their on-campus availability.

Writing Minor Course Proposals

The minor is outlined in brief at http://www.du.edu/writing/writing_minor/.

Teaching a WRIT course in the minor will count as an annual project, in the same way that teaching an FSEM course counts as an annual project. Faculty may choose to adjust their teaching load so that they teach no more than three courses in a quarter (teaching one or more 1122s or 1133s in the fall, for example), or they may choose to teach four courses in a quarter.

What should the proposal include?

Your proposal should have two components: 1) Write a solid paragraph that is "camera ready" for an audience of undergrads who might be attracted to the course. Describe the course in a way that they would find clear and appealing. Of course, the secondary audience for this paragraph is your peers in the Writing Program, who will want to see a legitimate and well-grounded course. That secondary audience will be most persuaded by your second component. 2) Write a general draft syllabus for the course, focusing on the topics, readings, and writing activities you propose. We don't need policies, office hours, etc., nor do we need a very highly detailed syllabus. We just need a clear enough sense of the course to make an informed decision.

How will the proposals be judged?

1. Course quality, that is, the extent to which it's informed by good disciplinary theory and practice.
2. Appeal to prospective students' needs and interests.
3. Variety in relation to recent offerings in the minors.

For proposals that do well in all three criteria, preference will go to faculty who have not recently taught a minors course, and to faculty who can teach the course on-load in lieu of an annual project. The Executive Director will put out a call for proposals by winter quarter for the following year.

Other Teaching Opportunities

FSEM

The seminar, approved by the faculty in the spring of 2004, introduces first-year students to the intellectual, academic, and community expectations of the university. The First-Year Seminar is a small (15 students), four-credit, academically rigorous course that also provides students with year-long mentoring and academic advising. FSEM is required of all first-year students each fall.

The FSEM program is a showcase feature of undergraduate education at DU. Professors teaching these courses enjoy the opportunity to design a special topic course of personal interest for students eager to experience the university's intellectual environment. Faculty receive financial support for course preparation, for course development, and for special events and activities. Faculty members who teach First-Year Seminars also serve as their students' academic advisors during their first year.

Writing Program professors can apply to teach FSEM—first by submitting a request and description of the course to the Executive Director of the Writing Program, and upon approval,

completing the application process established by the First-Year Seminar Committee, overseen by the Vice Provost for University Academic Programs. A request for proposals for these fall courses is typically distributed late in the fall or early in the winter quarter. The Assistant Director for First-Year Writing sits on the FSEM committee.

ASEM

All undergraduates at the University of Denver are required to take an Advanced Seminar (ASEM), an upper-level course capped at 15 students. The Writing Program provides faculty development and support for these classes, working with faculty from across campus to design courses that will fulfill the course goals. Writing Program faculty who would like to teach an ASEM (instead of completing an annual project) should contact Doug Hesse. Below are the guidelines created by the ASEM Committee.

Proposing a Course. The ASEM Committee approves all ASEM courses and has specific deadlines for turning in proposals. Doug Hesse is currently serving as chair for the ASEM Committee, and Joseph Ponce is the administrative staff member assisting. If you are proposing an entirely new ASEM Course, go to the ASEM Committee Website at http://portfolio.du.edu/ASEM and select the link to the New Proposal Form.

Faculty Development Support. After completing a required ASEM Writing Workshop on writing across the curriculum, all participants receive a stipend of $1000. The ASEM Writing Workshop funding is on top of the $1000 that faculty receive for developing a new ASEM course. Faculty may apply for small grants to support teaching in their courses (guest speakers, film rentals, field trips, etc.).

Short Article about Writing in ASEM Courses. Faculty receive $500 for completing an article. Once a year, faculty may write a short article (5 to 10 pages) about the writing component they developed for their course. This piece should briefly introduce the course in ways that would be clear to nonexpert faculty colleagues, explain the writing assignments and teaching practices you developed, and include some discussion of what you hope the writing component will achieve and why.

You might also discuss possible challenges you anticipate the students facing—or that you might face in teaching the course. Write for an audience of DU faculty members.

The Writing Program may select and edit some of these articles for use in future workshops, publish them on the website, or so on. (We will contact you before we do so!) The Writing Program will process your $500 payment immediately on receiving your article, and it will show up in your next monthly paycheck. Since 2007, over 100 DU faculty have participated in three-day workshops, as preamble to their teaching a Writing Intensive Core course. This slim volume collects the work of seventeen professors as they reflect on the Writing Intensive Core. Please view Teaching and Troubling Writing Intensive Courses (available on the Writing Program website at https://www.du.edu/writing/media/documents/teaching-and-troubling-writing-intensive-courses.pdf).

Overload Teaching, Summer Teaching, and Reassignment

Faculty in the program may have the opportunity to teach a WRIT class as an overload or during the summer quarter. Overload courses are paid at $4200, with funds dispersed in the quarter in which the overload does, in fact, become overload—generally, spring quarter. Summer courses are paid on a sliding scale depending on enrollments. Faculty will receive $4200 per course, provided a full enrollment of at least 7 students.

If fewer than 7 students are enrolled by the end of the first week of class, faculty salary will be determined on a sliding scale.

- 6 students = $3500.
- 5 students = $3000.
- 4 students = $2500.
- 3 students = $2000.
- Classes with fewer than three students may be conducted as independent studies, at the professor's discretion; compensation will be $500 per student.

Given that summer payments must be set up by May 15th, faculty will be paid based on enrollments at that point. If additional students join later, a separate payment will be made to cover the difference.

Faculty may request an overload class for any quarter, and these requests will be honored if courses are available, using a standard priority system in case of conflicts. In some cases, the program will need to have all or part of a course covered on an emergency basis. In such cases, a call will go out on the Charleslamb-l listserv, and priority will go to whoever is first to answer the call (unless some unusually strong consideration merits offering the opportunity to someone else).

In some cases, a faculty member may have good reason to be reassigned to duties other than teaching. For instance, a scheduled class may not be fully enrolled and there may be no available alternative classes, or the program may have a strong need to have a substantial task done by a faculty member during the winter or spring quarters. The Executive Director and the Assistant Director will confer to determine the reassignment in these cases. Faculty members may suggest particular reassignments, but the final decision will be made by at the Executive Director's sole discretion.

Office Hours

Faculty must hold at least four office hours per week and must be generously available to meet with students at other times. Professors are expected to be on campus several hours per week. At the beginning of every quarter, during week one, please send The Assistant Director and the Office Manager your scheduled office hours.

Syllabi

Uploading your syllabi and other course documents both helps the Writing Program keep accurate records of all our courses and builds a repository of ideas for your colleagues. The

Writing Program frequently receives requests for old syllabi from transferring students, so it is vital that you upload them to Portfolio.

Each teaching and adjunct faculty member has a folder in the Teaching Files section of the Writing Program Portfolio page. Faculty should upload the following documents in Portfolio each quarter taught at DU:

- The syllabus you hand out during week one (submitted at that time).
- A comprehensive syllabus that reflects the course as you taught it. The final comprehensive syllabus should include all the assignments you made. If you taught the exact same class for all sections that you taught, you need only upload one syllabus.

Please upload your syllabus and additional teaching files as you create them, or at least no later than indicated in the table under the Annual Review Process in Chapter 2.

Uploading Directions
1. Login to Portfolio (https://portfolio.du.edu/login).
2. Select the Writing Program Portfolio page (http://portfolio.du.edu/writing).
3. Under the "Teaching Files" tab, find your folder in the second column.
4. Click the pencil icon to the right of your name to edit your folder.
5. Add files, being sure to name them in a way that's accessible to others.

If you have any problems uploading, please contact the Office Manager.

Activity Insight/Digital Measures

Activity Insight (also labeled as Digital Measures within the site) is a mandatory location for entering your career information, for the benefit of DU and the program, as well as for your reappointment and promotion purposes. It may be accessed from PioneerWeb following this protocol: Click the Faculty tab, then look in the Faculty Activities area and click the "Manage Your Activities" button.

Most critically, the site functions as the record of your achievement for your annual review within the program. At a minimum, you need to include the information itemized for annual review in Chapter 2 above. Under "General Information," click the Writing Program Annual Reports link and choose or add the appropriate year.

The site also functions as an online C.V., presenting information about all accomplishments of note for DU faculty. Each spring, DU uses the information available in Activity Insight to prepare for a spring recognition event, honoring faculty for their scholarly achievements. Typically, your information must be entered by the end of April for your achievements to be included at this event. To update your achievements, select the appropriate link from the "Scholarship/Research" heading:

Intellectual Contributions – Publications and Written Work
Intellectual Contributions – Artistic Performances and Exhibits
Intellectual Contributions – Presentations

Student Concerns

For questions or concerns about Writing Program policies, grade complaints, classroom tenor, etc., you can contact the Assistant Director for First-Year Writing, Richard Colby.

DU also provides a number of resources when you have concerns about a student. None of these is mutually exclusive, and it is often helpful for the student if you use any that apply to the situation in question.

For questions or concerns about student well-being—academic or emotional— DU encourages its faculty to make use of the Pioneers CARE webpage (https://www.du.edu/studentlife/studentsupport/pioneers_care/) to submit a confidential concern report if necessary. You may also submit a message of this kind in PioneerWeb, looking in the Student Referral area for the Pioneers Care link. Typically, these reports address the needs of students who mainly need personal support, even if the consequences may be academic as well. You will receive notice that your report has been received, but you will not always hear further about what action has been taken based on these reports.

If students are doing poorly in your class, you should first communicate with them directly. You may submit a failing midterm grade through PioneerWeb, though this has become the less favored approach. To do that, click on the Faculty tab and look in the Grades and Student Information area to click the Grade Entry button, following the instructions on that page to submit grades. DU currently favors having you use the Faculty Feedback link in PioneerWeb. Click the Faculty tab and look in the Student Referral area for that link. The Faculty Feedback page lets faculty members enter an anticipated grade and place a comment in the student's permanent record. These comments are available to students, so they should not include information that you do not want students to access. Comments should generally state the exact nature of the problems and reflect earlier attempts to remedy problems. The Faculty Feedback area will also tell you that some students are "Monitored," meaning that they have had some kind of academic difficulty before. Advising welcomes having some kind of report on the progress of all monitored students by midterm.

You may also contact academic advising directly, if you have questions or concerns about a student's academic standing.

For International students, the International House offers language learning tutoring, working with students on writing, speaking, and reading. Tutoring is held in the I-House, and students can get the schedule and sign up there. The Writing Center also welcomes International Students, but its focus is, of course, on writing, not on grammar instruction or correction. Neither the I-House nor the Writing Center offer proof-reading; both focus on helping students develop the skills they need, not on correcting documents.

Calling Off Class

Faculty who must miss a class to attend a professional conference should plan alternative activities for their students (individual or group conferences; an online writing activity; a student peer-response session; etc.). If you need to miss more than one course in a term, please try to find a colleague who can facilitate an activity you devise. Illness or sudden emergency are another matter. Alert the Assistant

Director and Office Manager by email right away, so they're ready to answer any questions from students or others. If, on short notice, you can't arrange for a colleague to meet your class, notify your students via email **<u>and</u>** via Canvas notification. The Office Manager or a colleague may be able to put a sign in your classroom(s) as an additional way of notifying students, but frequently this isn't possible.

Engagement with the University

The structure of the university and the Writing Program's
ongoing events and initiatives

T he **Writing Program is a University Academic Program** and reports
directly to the Provost, through Vice Provost Jennifer Karas. It is not under
the umbrella of another academic unit or college, and therefore does not
report to one of the deans. The following describes the organizational
structure of the University of Denver.

DU Organizational Structure

Chancellor's Office. The Chancellor, Jeremy Haefner, exercises broad responsibilities for all
aspects of the operation of the university. The Chancellor reports to the Board of Trustees. The
Chancellor shares the university's vision, promotes its values, embraces its mission and ensures
that it meets its goals.

Provost's Office. The Provost is responsible for maintaining and enhancing the academic quality,
intellectual inquiry, and research, creative, and scholarly activities across the university. The
Provost provides strategic planning and budgeting for the university and oversees all academic,
research and related units of the university. As the chief academic officer of the university, the
Provost provides leadership, with comprehensive administrative responsibility for colleges,
schools, divisions, departments, libraries, centers and institutes, faculty, staff and students, and
those units that serve the university's academic needs. In carrying out their responsibilities, the
Provost works directly with the deans of the colleges, schools and divisions, with faculties, and
with vice provosts and other members of the Provost's staff. Corinne Lengsfeld is the interim
Provost.

Vice Provost. Jennifer Karas leads University Academic Programs as Vice Provost. In addition to the
Writing Program, UAP also houses the Boettcher Scholars; Center for Community Engagement and
Service Learning; Core Curriculum; Living & Learning Communities; the Pioneer Leadership Program;
Undergraduate Research; External Fellowships & Scholarships; and the University Honors Program.

Academic Units

Undergraduates at DU can pursue over 100 degree programs in each of the eight schools and

colleges, including traditional majors and dual degree programs spanning a variety of disciplines. The brief descriptions of the academic units below focus on undergraduate options in each school or college.

College of Arts, Humanities & Social Sciences
Offers a variety of degree programs, minors, certificates, and interdisciplinary opportunities for undergraduates, such as History, Political Science, Religious Studies, Psychology, and Women's and Gender Studies.

Division of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
Offers majors and minors in six departments and a variety of interdisciplinary programs including tourism, sustainability, geographic and information systems, and environmental studies.

Daniels College of Business
Offers undergraduates a choice of 12 business majors plus a BS degree in accountancy. Key learning outcomes for all undergraduate programs include ethics, values, and law; technical expertise, communication and interpersonal effectiveness, critical and innovative thinking, and global and intercultural competence.

Josef Korbel School of International Studies
Offers undergraduates a major in international studies with a variety of specializations; the general emphasis is on the impact of policy on human welfare and interconnectedness of an emerging global society.

Morgridge College of Education
Offers a 5-year BA/MA program that includes work for Colorado teaching licensure and/or minors in contemporary issues in education, teacher education, and urban education.

School of Engineering and Computer Science
Has three departments—Mechanical and Materials Engineering, Electrical & Computer Engineering, and Computer Science. Offers 8 MA and several MA and PhD programs.

University College
Offers people who have at least one year of existing undergraduate credits both on-campus and online courses to complete a BA while continuing to work full time.

Additional graduate-degree granting units include:
Graduate School of Professional Psychology
Graduate School of Social Work
Sturm College of Law

Faculty Senate
The Faculty Senate is the primary body through which the faculty participate in the shared governance of the University of Denver. The Senate is composed of approximately 50 Members who are elected to represent the academic units of the university. Currently, the Writing Program has three faculty senators, each of whom serves a three-year term. Senate meetings are

held monthly throughout the academic year. The minutes of the most recent meetings can be read or downloaded at https://www.du.edu/facsen/minutes.html.

Much of the Senate's work is accomplished through its five Standing Committees:
- Academic Planning
- Financial Planning
- Nominations, Credentials & Rules
- Personnel
- Student Relations

The Senate Executive Committee includes the Chairs of the five Standing Committees, the President, The Past President, the Secretary, the Communications Officer, and at-large members.

Other Administrative Offices

Academic Assessment
Campus Life & Inclusive Excellence
Center for Community Engagement to advance Scholarship and Learning (CCESL)
Center for Multicultural Excellence
Graduate Studies and Research
Institutional Research
Office of Internationalization
Office of the Registrar
Office of Research and Sponsored Programs
Office of Teaching and Learning
Planning and Budget
Special Community Programs

General Education at the University of Denver

The University of Denver General Education curriculum is currently under review by the General Education and Review Committee (Doug Hesse is the chair). The current common curriculum is outlined here:

The Common Curriculum provides students with a well-rounded education, creates context for major or minor course of study, and introduces students to new areas of interest. The Common Curriculum is grounded in a breadth of experiences and ways of inquiry congruent with the University's goal of providing an outstanding educational experience that empowers students to integrate and apply knowledge from across the disciplines and imagine new possibilities for themselves, their communities, and their world. Consistent with the university's mission, the Common Curriculum promotes learning by engaging with students in advancing scholarly inquiry, cultivating critical and creative thought, and generating knowledge.

Common Curriculum courses contribute to an intellectually vibrant campus community and create in turn a challenging, inclusive, ethical, and liberating learning environment. From students' initial First-Year Seminar to the culminating Advanced Seminar, the curriculum encourages

connections across modes of learning. By engaging in course work across diverse experiences and areas of knowledge, DU students cultivate critical thought and creative thought, preparing them for leadership and citizenship in our global society.

An undergraduate at the university typically takes 52 to 60 credits in the Common Curriculum:

First-Year Seminar	4 credits
Writing and Rhetoric	8 credits
Language	4-12 credits
Ways of Knowing	32 credits
Advanced Seminar	4 credits

Academic Advising

Advising support exists on multiple levels, with multiple avenues for consultation; however, the primary source for student's undergraduate academic career at DU is their Faculty Adviser, whether the student is a first-year, transfer, or continuing student. While advising resources abound, it is important for students to be active participants in the advising process and take personal accountability for their academic experience. All information for student advising can be found on PioneerWeb, Faculty tab, Advising Resources box. The Registrar's Office also has a useful and extensive FAQ section that covers most student needs. Additionally, the Academic Resources office, located in the Driscoll Underground, is staffed by full-time professionals with advanced degrees and offers assistance to students beyond basic degree planning and registration.

First-Year Students. Students' First-Year Seminar (FSEM) instructor, or Faculty Advisor, serves as their primary adviser for their first year at DU. Even if students are admitted with enough credits to have sophomore standing, they are considered first-time, first-year students and will receive advising through their Faculty Advisor. The advising that students receive from their Faculty Advisor is often supplemented by specific major advising through individual departments or, if they are business students, through the Daniels College of Business's Office of Undergraduate Programs.

Transfer and Continuing Students. If a student has declared a major and/or minor, he receives advising from the Faculty Advisers in their major or minor departments. If students have not declared a major, Academic Advisers are available to assist them through registration and the selection of a major (which they must declare after completing 75 credits). All non-business students should see an Academic Adviser in the Academic Advising office.

Pre-Professional Advising. If students are interested in pursuing law or a health professions school after graduation, the Academic Advisors in the Center for Academic and Career Development have a specific pre-professional adviser who can assist these students.

Writing Program Faculty Meetings

Traditionally, the Writing Program has held full weekly faculty meetings on Tuesdays and committee or working group meetings on many Thursdays during the fall quarter, and it has met about every three weeks (or as needed) during the winter and spring quarters. Meetings normally

use an entire two-hour class period when all (or at least most) faculty will be available. Meetings offer opportunities for shared governance and professional development.

Ongoing Writing Program Events & Initiatives

The Writing Program hosts a number of initiatives, both annual events and publications, and develops focused and longitudinal studies of student writing and pedagogical approaches. Historic, completed initiatives can be found in Appendix 3. Following are some ongoing or recent initiatives.

WRIT Large: Publication of Student Writing. A journal of undergraduate research and writing at DU begun in the winter of 2012, WRIT Large serves as a resource and teaching tool for our faculty, as well as a source of inspiration for students in our WRIT classes. WRIT Large is published every year in the spring and highlights an exemplary array of academic writing across disciplines. Lauren Picard is currently developing a website to enhance the online editions of the magazine. WRIT Large was started by Liz Drogin, Megan Kelly, Heather Martin, and Juli Parrish.

Community Writing Centers. Since 2008, the Writing Center has partnered with two daytime, drop-in homeless shelters here in Denver—The Gathering Place and the St. Francis Center. At both sites we offer one-on-one writing consultations, similar to those offered on campus, with the clients and staff of our community partners. Since its inception, this project has been a joint effort between faculty and student writing center consultants, and we periodically need new faculty consultants at these sites (previous experience in our on-campus center is a pre-requisite). New faculty interested in participating should be able to commit to at least two consecutive quarters of work, and must be free to work off-campus during at least one, and preferably two, of the following times: Mondays 2-4 pm; Tuesdays 10-11:30 am; Fridays 12:30-2:30 pm. The Community Writing Centers were founded by Eliana Schonberg, Geoffrey Bateman, and John Tiedemann. Recent faculty working here include John Tiedemann, Rob Gilmor, Libby Catchings, and Matt Hill.

WRIT Engagement Corps. The WRIT Engagement Corps is a pilot program developed by Liz Drogin in the spring of 2015 that positioned nine DU undergraduates as instructors in a writing enrichment course at Grant Beacon Middle School. The group facilitated a course called "The Power of Stories," and the curriculum involved reading, writing, and talking about meaningful narratives in society. In 2016, Sarah Hart Micke took over as coordinator of this effort.

Writing Center Projects. The Writing Center has active partnerships, focused on offering programs to support undergraduate and graduate writers, with the Roger Salters Institute (IRISE), the Study Abroad program, the Undergraduate Research Center, the Language Tutoring Center, the Department of Languages & Literatures, the Science Center, the Music Library, Career Services, the Office of Graduate Education, Campus Life & Inclusive Excellence, and the library's Research Center. Each year, consultants are actively involved in developing programs and resources—from creative write-ins and pop-up consulting sites to staff workshops and writing groups—and conducting research and assessment. Since 2015, 46 consultants have presented at 15 regional and national conferences, and several are currently developing manuscripts to submit to academic journals.

Workshops. The Writing Program and Writing Center host a number of workshops for writing development across campus. Although there is some overlap in terms of who arranges such workshops, it is generally the case that the Writing Program sponsors workshops for ASEM, FSEM, and other faculty development, while the Writing Center arranges workshops for undergraduate and graduate classes and programs. Recent faculty workshop topics have included "Enhancing Hybrid Pedagogies: Blending F2F and Online Methods," "ASEM Course Development," and "After WRIT: Leveling Up Student Writing." Writing Center workshops have included designing and printing research posters, writing statements of purpose, developing grant proposals, reflective writing, constructing literature reviews, and more.

Encountering Stories/Many Voices, One DU. In the fall of 2016, DU commenced the "One Book, One DU" initiative, a university common reading program for first-year students. The Writing Program, spearheaded by Lauren Picard, responded with "Encountering Stories." This fall event celebrates and showcases first-year writers' responses to DU's One Book, One DU prompt. We display all genres of responses—essays, drawings, videos, oral performances, comic books, and more. In the spring, we publish "Many Voices, One DU," a collection of stories and essays from undergraduate and graduate students, alumni, staff, and faculty across campus. The book honors the many voices that combine to form our DU community.

Writing Program Awards
The Writing Program offers a number of awards each year.

The Achievement Award for WRIT 22
1. All faculty members teaching two or more WRIT 22 courses may designate up to two of their own students to receive the Achievement Award for WRIT 22. Faculty members teaching a single WRIT 22 course may designate a single winner.

2. The purpose of this award is to recognize and celebrate outstanding student writers enrolled in WRIT 22 courses in the fall or winter quarters and to gather nominations for the Fall Showcase (described below).

3. The Executive Director of Writing will send reminders to all WRIT 22 faculty, at the beginning of the term and at the end of the term, to select their winners. Selections are due to the Executive Director by Friday of the first week of the spring quarter.

4. To complete the selection process, faculty should provide **either** 1) a piece of writing or a portfolio of writing for each student, along with a sentence or two of context, **or** 2) a statement of 75 words or less that highlights what distinguishes the student as an outstanding writer. Faculty should nominate also determine the Fall Showcase category for which the student will be nominated, choosing from the following:
    a. Best Rhetorical Performance (academic genre).
    b. Best Rhetorical Performance (popular genre).
    c. Best Rhetorical Analysis.
    d. Best Multimodal Project.
    e. Best All-around Writer (which might include best overall portfolio, best in-class engagement, best improvement, etc.).

5. All nominees will receive a Certificate.

Director's Award for Writing
1. Faculty may additionally nominate one or both of their Achievement Award winners to be considered for the Director's Award for Writing. Up to five Director's Awards will be given each year.

2. The purpose of this award is to recognize and celebrate five outstanding WRIT 22 writers, as demonstrated by their written work.

3. Nominations for this award are due to the Executive Director by Friday of the first week of the spring quarter.

4. Nominations will consist of **either** 1) a piece of writing or a portfolio of writing for each nominee, accompanied by a sentence or two of context, **or** 2) contact information for the student (Name, email, and DU ID). In the case of #2, the Executive Director will ask the student to provide materials by April 1.

5. On behalf of the Steering Committee, the Executive Director will ask for volunteers to serve on the Director's Awards Screening Committee. The Steering Committee will appoint that group, and the group will select its chair.

6. Winners may be of any genre or purpose assigned in WRIT 22 courses and will be chosen for their demonstrated excellence in achieving their respective genre or purpose.

7. Director's Awards for Writing will be presented each May at the DU Pioneer Awards Ceremony.

Annual Writing Awards and Fall Showcase
1. The Department will establish a Fall Showcase Committee (FSC) to manage annual writing awards. On behalf of the Steering Committee, the Executive Director will ask for volunteers to serve on the FSC. The Steering Committee will appoint that group, and the group will select its chair, establish its processes and calendar, select award winners, and serve as the planning committee for the Fall Showcase

2. All faculty who teach WRIT 33 courses throughout the year and who teach WRIT 22 courses in the Spring may nominate one student per section of those courses for Fall Showcase Awards, in the following categories:
   a. Best Rhetorical Performance (academic genre).
   b. Best Rhetorical Performance (popular genre).
   c. Best Rhetorical Analysis.
   d. Best Multimodal Project.
   e. Best All-around Writer (which might include best overall portfolio, best in-class engagement, best improvement, etc.).

3. Faculty who teach a course in the Minor may also nominate a student for each of these categories:
   a. Best Scholarly/Analytic Performance by a Writing Minor.
   b. Best Creative/Popular Rhetorical Performance by a Writing Minor.

4. The FSC will send reminders to all WRIT 33 faculty, at the beginning of the term and at the end of the term, to select their winners. Selections are normally due to the FSC by the Friday following the June commencement.

5. To complete the selection process, faculty should provide the award category and a piece of writing or a portfolio of writing for each student, except that, for students nominated for Best All-around Writer, faculty may a forward a statement of 75 words or less that highlights what distinguishes the student as an outstanding writer.

6. Students may nominate their own writing for the Fall Showcase, but faculty may not offer extra credit for self-nomination. Self-nominating students would need to fill out a form (50-word limit) explaining why they chose a particular piece to represent them and selecting a category other than Best All-around Writer.

7. The FSC is not obliged to give an award in any category in which the quality of submissions is deemed insufficiently strong.

8. The FSC will determine semifinalists and winners during the summer term; it will notify semi-finalists and winners of their selection and invite them to the Fall Showcase.

9. The FSC will present a Fall Showcase event in the fall quarter, before week 6, to recognize winners, semifinalists, and WRIT 22 Achievement Award winners, as well as their work. Presentation and display opportunities will be determined by the FSC as part of planning the Fall Showcase.

Hornbeck Scholarship
1. The Hornbeck Scholarship is an endowed award to a single outstanding first-year writer each year. The amount varies with the endowment, but it generally has been around $8000.

2. Finalists for the Hornbeck Scholarship will come from three sources:
   - Winners of the Director's Award.
   - Faculty nominations; each faculty member may nominate a single student.
   - Student self-applications.

3. The Executive Director will put out a call for nominations/self-nominations for the Hornbeck Award by April 1. The program office will contact winners of the Director's Award, inform them of the Hornbeck scholarship, and ask them to complete an application package by the due date.

4. Faculty who wish to nominate a student for the award may do so by providing the student's name, email address, and a few sentences explaining the basis for their nomination. This is

due by April 15 in order to allow the program office to contact nominated students, inviting them to complete an application package by May 1. WRIT faculty should inform current students about the Hornbeck award and the application process.

5. Finalists must submit a portfolio of their work by May 1 of each year.

6. To be considered for the award, students must submit a short letter about themselves as writers (300 words or less), plus three additional pieces of writing. At least two must come from a WRIT class. The complete package (letter plus three writings) should be incorporated into a single document. It should be sent as an email attachment to the Office Manager by 4pm, May 1st. The subject line of the email should be "Hornbeck Scholarship Application."

7. The Executive Director will invite two or three Writing Program faculty to join in reviewing the finalist portfolios. The winner will be chosen by May 15.

Chapter

5

Resources

Support and resources within the program and the university

T **Writing Program** and the university provide supportive resources to ensure that the program and all its members can work together successfully.

Office of Teaching and Learning

The mission of the Office of Teaching and Learning (OTL) is to promote and support a culture at the University of Denver that values and rewards excellence in teaching and learning by providing professional development opportunities to improve teaching practices for new and experienced faculty members, developing and supporting state-of-the-art technology and web-based applications that enhance student learning, and collaborating with faculty on innovative teaching projects. Hence, OTL's mission supports the university's mission "...to promote learning by engaging with students in advancing scholarly inquiry, cultivating critical and creative thought, and generating knowledge." Their goals also reflect those of the university.

Learning—To support faculty in achieving their full potential as teacher/scholars in pursuit of enhanced student learning
Scholarship—To support effective, evidence-based and inquiry-based scholarly teaching among our faculty
Community—To serve as a hub for the exploration, development and dissemination of technology for teaching and scholarship

OTL offers a variety of resources including, workshops and seminars, consultations and teaching support, on-line teaching support, along with academic software and technology. Past and present examples include: DU Course Media, Lecture Capture, Zoom, Software Development Projects, Mobile Development, and Electronic Capstones. To familiarize yourself with OTL resources, please visit their website, at http://otl.du.edu/. For general questions, contact otl@du.edu or 303-871-2084. For specific contacts, please consult the OTL staff directory.

Library

Anderson Academic Commons (AAC) is located in the heart of campus. In addition to housing DU's collection of books, print journals, reference materials, archives, and multimedia materials, it is also home to the Writing Program offices, the Writing Center, the Math Center, the Research Center, the Office of Teaching and Learning, and the IT Help Desk.

For their own research, faculty may make use of AAC's extensive resources, which include the classic library catalog, Prospector (a regional union catalog), Interlibrary Loan, and hundreds of subscription databases. Faculty may check out books and other resources for up to one year at a time by using their ID card. It is easy to view your account and renew materials online.

For their teaching, faculty may request course reserves, schedule library instruction, and use or develop course-specific research guides. The library also has a wealth of equipment available for check out—everything from camcorders to phone chargers—and a surprising variety of subscription-based services (Xfinity online, Rosetta Stone, etc.). Their website is worth carefully reviewing.

Laptops

Faculty members receive a laptop to use for their work. The laptop belongs to DU and is replaced every three years. Laptops are under warranty for all three years, so if issues arise, please speak with the Office Manager, The IT Help Center, and/or AppleCare. Faculty members may purchase their old laptops at current market value when they receive a new replacement.

Unless bought by the faculty member, laptops must be returned before receiving a new one. Please first visit the IT Help Center to have them wipe the memory before returning it. Laptops still owned by DU must be returned when faculty members leave DU.

Connecting to the Internet

DU WiFi is the on-campus wireless network. You can use DU WiFi on your laptops, phones and other wireless devices; connect to DU WiFi using your @du.edu email address and PioneerWeb password.

Eduroam is a more restricted campus network. If you need access to shared folders, department printers, DU Campus or iBanner while using a wireless connection on a laptop computer, you will need to connect to DU WiFi and then select "Restricted Use," which will direct you to the Eduroam network. Once you go through the initial connection process, you will then be able to select the Eduroam network whenever you need access to these restricted files and programs. You should only use Eduroam with a laptop computer, not with your mobile devices.

Every six months, you will be prompted to renew your campus password. Conveniently, that password update will apply to nearly all campus services. However, to activate that password change on your computer login screen, you may need to connect your campus laptop directly to the network using an Ethernet cable.

The IT Help Center

For most forms of technology support, use the IT Help Center in AAC270, very close to the Writing Program main office. You can seek help online at https://www.du.edu/it/contact, or you may call them at x14700. Be sure to indicate that you are a faculty member. Apple laptops come with Applecare, so some issues for them may be handled directly through Apple. Please do keep laptops in good condition and make sure to update as prompted. If you have any questions please reach out to the Office Manager or the IT Help Center.

Classroom Technology Support

Classroom support maintains nearly 200 smart classrooms on campus. Their mission is simple: to make an enhanced learning process possible through technology in the classrooms. They stand behind their technology so that DU faculty members have the right tools for teaching in the 21st century.

The Classroom Technology Support Staff is on-call daily from 8am-8pm on weekdays and 8am-4pm on Saturdays. Please contact them if you have any questions. Need training on classroom equipment? They would be happy to walk-through a room with you. Please call Classroom Support at 1-3595 to schedule an appointment.

Listserv (Charleslamb-l)

The Writing Program's listserv is named Charleslamb-l. All Writing Program faculty and staff are subscribed to this listserv. New faculty members will be added to the listserv by the Office Manager by their hire date. The default email address used for your listserv membership is your DU email address. To change email addresses, please contact the Office Manager. To send an email to the listserv, address the email to: charleslamb-l@du.edu

Portfolio

The University of Denver Portfolio Community (DUPC) is a fully developed web-based application that supports the academic community with a searchable database of electronic portfolios (for students, faculty, staff, and alumni), community discussion, academic program assessment based on student work, and an assessment rubric library. The assessment tools enable students, instructors and advisors to measure student learning and to use the results to effectively improve the curriculum. The portfolios and discussion forums provide a mechanism for unprecedented levels of sharing and communication within the DU community as well as with the world beyond the campus. Just note that if you would like to make use of any of the materials housed in the Teaching files on Portfolio, please contact the faculty member who designed and posted them—both as a courtesy and also to learn what modifications, if any, the author of the documents would recommend; many of the pieces posted are still works in progress.

The University of Denver Portfolio Community was created through a joint effort involving DU students, faculty members, and staff, and was funded in part by a generous grant from the Donald and Susan Sturm foundation. It is maintained by DU's Office of Teaching and Learning (OTL).

Having trouble with your Portfolio? Need some tutorials and user guides? OTL has multiple tutorials.

Personal Portfolios. Any person with a DU ID number and passcode may develop an electronic portfolio. Simply log in and select "Create Portfolio." Items in the portfolio may be set as private or made available to the public, to the DU community, or to selected groups of individuals.

Community Portfolios. DU students, staff, or faculty members may request a community portfolio under the "Community" tab, and the request will be evaluated by the portfolio community liaison. Community portfolios are used by committees, student groups, and faculty groups as a web space for discussion, sharing information, and maintaining contact. Departments/units use community portfolios for disseminating important materials to their members.

Specific Portfolio content may be made available to the public, the DU community, or selected groups of individuals. Guests may become community members at the discretion of the community manager.

The Writing Program Community Portfolio holds a vast array of teaching files, syllabi, archived presentations and data, and much, much more, at http://portfolio.du.edu/writing.

Course Portfolios. All DU instructors may view a list of students in their courses through DUPC, and have the option of setting up a course portfolio. The course instructor may choose to make content in the course portfolio available to only the students in the course, to select groups of individuals, or to the public. Discussion forums may be set up and guests may be added to the course portfolio at the discretion of the instructor.

Course Management System (Canvas)

DU uses Canvas as its course management system. Canvas offers normal utilities such as confidential online grade posting, assignment uploads and batch downloads, discussion areas, and student access to uploaded files. The Office of Teaching and Learning offers Canvas training sessions at several levels and of several kinds, mostly just before and after the start of the fall quarter. Faculty members may also set up their own online course support. Students, however, do expect to track their grades online, and providing that information outside of Canvas could raise problems with FERPA's confidentiality requirements.

Course Rosters

You may get current course rosters in PioneerWeb at any time after students start enrolling in your course, but there is a weird trick to it. **Do not use the "Class List" link** available under Grades and Student Information. Instead, after clicking the Faculty tab and looking under Grades and Student Information, use the "Display Class Photo Roster" link. After selecting your quarter and class, you will see a roster listing names under students; current campus photographs. Use this listing to generate the most current course roster. Canvas can also generate course rosters.

Program Equipment

The Writing Program has a variety of equipment available for faculty check out, including:

- Flipcams
- Digital Voice Recorders
- Laptops
- Laptop power cords
- HD Digital Camcorder
- Camcorder
- Digital Cameras
- Macbook and iPad dongles of multiple varieties
- Projectors
- Projector Screens
- Spare laptops
- External Hard Drives

To check out the equipment, please fill out the sign-out sheet in the Office Manager's office. Most equipment can be checked out only for 24 hours, but longer periods can be arranged in special circumstances.

Office Supplies

The Writing Program main office has cabinets filled with office supplies for faculty use. Additionally, the upstairs faculty lounge has two black cabinets filled with supplies. Please help yourself to supplies that aid your teaching and research. If you need any special office supplies that are not in cabinets, please talk to the Office Manager. Some supplies might be specially available that aren't readily accessible, or that could easily be purchased for you, or that could come out of your professional development budget.

Adobe Creative Cloud

All DU students, faculty, and staff have access to Adobe CC through their DU email and password. Visit the related IT website (https://www.du.edu/it/services/software/adobe-creative-cloud) for instructions about how to download and access these programs. Tutorials are available on Lynda.com, to which community members also have free access.

Copying & Printing

All DU common printers should be loaded to your laptop (if not please contact the IT Help Center), and you can print to common printers (such as the library printers) by using your DU ID card. Faculty get $50 in free printing each week, which is especially useful for color printing on common printers.

The Writing Program department printers need to be installed to new laptops. You can get these printers installed by making an appointment with the IT Help Center; make sure to tell them you are faculty, and a tech will meet with you to install the printers. If you're feeling technologically adroit, you can install the Writing Program copier using IP Address 10.244.30.53.

Faxing

You can fax items on the Konika Minolta copier in the Writing Program office by selecting Fax/Scan button - Direct Input - Fax. For on-campus numbers enter the extension in the same way you would with your campus Cisco phone. For off-campus numbers, first enter 9, then 1, then the 10 digit number. Example: 9-1-303-444-7691.

Place the pages to be faxed face up on the feed tray and press start. The fax machine will only tell you if the fax did not go through, not if it did go through. Please wait several minutes after you've faxed something to ensure your fax was completed. If after several attempts the job does not go through, please contact the Office Manager for assistance.

Phone and Voicemail

All faculty members are provided an office phone. For any phone/ voicemail-related issues, you can put in a service request with the IT Help Center. For on-campus calls, dial the last five digits of the number (1-xxxx). For calls in the local 303 or 720 area codes, dial 9 and then the full number. For other calls in the United States, dial 9-1 and then the full number. For campus information, dial 0 on your campus phone, or 303-871-2000 from a personal phone. During business hours, campus information can help you find the numbers you might need.

Campus Security and Help When Locked Out

Campus Security can be reached at 303-871-2334. That is a good number to put into your contacts. Among other services, Campus Security can let you into locked classrooms or into your office if you have forgotten your keys. During business hours, you may also borrow a key to your office temporarily from the Office Manager. Contrary to rumor, Library staff cannot help you get into your office if you have forgotten your keys. The Building Coordinator can, but that position changes often, so Campus Security is probably the best solution to remember.

Text Books & Desk Copies

Bookstore. Faculty are in charge of placing their textbook orders with the bookstore. **Book orders are due before advising begins for the term for which the books are requested.** This deadline is important to meet so as to be in compliance with the Higher Education Opportunity Act (HEOA). Please also let the bookstore know if you will not be ordering any textbooks. Email Matt Averach (1282txt@follett.com) at Follett with any questions or last minute changes.

If you do not have an eFollet account:
1. Visit https://adoptions.efollett.com/OnlineAdoptionsWeb/onlineAdoptions.html?storeNumber=1282&langId=en_US
2. Click on the new user banner and enter "1282" in the first box (store supplied password)
3. In the 5th box (Role) it will ask if you are an approver or a submitter, you want to set your account up as an approver to ensure that the adoption processes through as soon as you click submit.

If you already have an eFollet account:
1. Visit https://adoptions.efollett.com/
2. Select Order Course Materials, and New Order (you can use the re-order button in the future if you are re-using the books for the same class)

3. Use the drop down menus to select Program (University of Denver), Term (Fall 2020, Spring 2020, etc), Department (WRIT), Course(Course Number, not CRN), and then Section (1, 2, 201, etc.). Instructor should populate with your last name if the system has you linked to the class. Estimated Enrollment (this needs to be filled out, but is automatically updated every day by the Registrar). The 3 boxes below should be used if the students do not need materials from the bookstore (for your class we talked about previously you could click on the top box "No Materials Required." Click Continue to go to next screen.
4. If you have no materials it will take you to the "Review Order Screen." If you need to order books, skip the boxes and click continue on the bottom, it will take you to the "How Would You Like to Add Course Materials?" page.
5. The next screen will ask you to enter books by ISBN, or Search by Author and Title. Click "By ISBN" for the fastest search. Add titles and then click continue on the bottom of the page. This will take you back to the "Review" screen and if there are images of the book covers you will be able to see them here to confirm it is the right title. Click continue at the bottom.
6. This will take you to the review screen; if everything is correct, click complete order.
7. This will generate an OA# for you, and you will also get an email confirming the order.

How to Order Desk Copies
Google the publisher of your book to find the company website. Look for the Academic tab or section. Usually, this section will have links to instructions for ordering desk copies. If there's no Academic section, search in the FAQ or Contact Us page. You will probably be asked to fill out an online form or to send an email with information about your class, how many students you're teaching, etc. If you get stumped, please don't hesitate to ask the Office Manager. Some books (especially from foreign presses) are almost impossible to get as free desk copies; you may have to purchase those. Included below is the contact information for some of the more popular academic presses. You can contact them directly for desk copies.

Bedford/St. Martin's | Use this link (https://us.macmillan.com/tradebooksforcourses/desk-and-exam-copies/) to determine which press to contact
McGraw Hill | Use this form
(https://www.mhprofessionalresources.com/getpage.php?c=requestreviewcopy.php).

Event Planning
All events in which the Writing Program interacts with the greater DU or Denver community should be facilitated by the Office Manager. It is the Office Manager's responsibility to secure room rentals, set up catering, process stipends or honoraria, and contact vendors. The Writing Program has a reciprocal agreement with the library and generally isn't charged for the use of rooms or A/V equipment in AAC. The important exception: we're charged a nominal fee for setting up the Special Events room for anything besides the standard set-up of round tables. Thus, when hosting events please plan to hold them in AAC. The bigger and/or nicer rooms are often booked far in advance, so it is recommended that you let the Office Manager know about events as far in advance as possible to ensure access to preferred spaces. Catering and A/V requests should be made no less than two weeks before the event.

When it is appropriate to check availability or to make arrangements on your own, you may book

campus rooms using the 25Live website at https://25live.collegenet.com/du/. Most likely, you will want to consult with the Office Manager when using 25Live for the first time.

Group study rooms in AAC can be booked by anyone for group work or meetings. Reserve these rooms on a first-come, first-served basis using the Group Study Rooms "Reserve" link on the library's reservation website, https://library.du.edu/services/room-reservations.html.

Professional Development Funds.

Faculty have access to $500 a year for professional development. DU can't reimburse in-state sales tax (so if you buy a book from Tattered Cover, we will reimburse the book but not the tax). As long as the professional development purchase clearly can be used to enhance your professional research, teaching, or classroom support, no additional explanation other than the receipt is required. If more information is needed, the Office Manager or the Executive Director will ask for an explanatory email. Itemized receipts can be turned in to the Office Manager for reimbursement. Purchases made through Amazon cannot be reimbursed. If you'd like to purchase something from Amazon, please ask the Office Manager to purchase it for you.

Program Travel Funding Guidelines

The Writing Program provides funding of $1000 to support professional travel that is relevant to a faculty member's professional role. The Writing Program will provide full funding (up to $1000) to faculty with an active role at a professional meeting broadly related to composition studies: presenting a paper, chairing a panel, participating in a roundtable, serving on an executive committee, and so on.

The Writing Program will also fund, on a percentage basis, one attendance without a formal active role at selected professional meetings in rhetoric and composition studies; please see the schedule* below.

As soon as you know travel plans, you should complete an online Travel Fund Request Form (the link is located in Travel & PD Information section of the Writing Program Portfolio site—not on Concur). The Executive Director of Writing will approve the specific amount in advance of the trip so you know what to expect for reimbursement. With rare exceptions, all travel requests in a fiscal year should be submitted by May 1, so that funds remaining in the program can be considered for reallocation, including for secondary trips or expenses beyond $1000. Immediately following a trip, travelers must complete an expense report in Concur (or provide the Office Manager with the resources to do it for you) and provide all necessary receipts. Faculty may use Professional Development Funds (up to $500) to supplement travel expenses beyond $1000. Travel funds are governed by the fiscal year structure of the university's budget. They must be expended and reimbursed within the current fiscal year (July 1—June 30). All purchases must follow university purchasing policy.

*Reimbursement schedule for rhetoric and composition studies meetings without a formal role: CCCC = 80% up to $800; NCTE, RSA, Penn State, Western States, Watson, IWCA, and WPA = 70% up to $750; other rhetoric and composition studies meetings = 50% up to $500.
Note: you may make a case for "other" meetings being of such importance as to merit a higher reimbursement rate.

Using Concur or Submitting Receipts

The university employs an online platform called Concur or Pioneer Travel & Expense for all reimbursements. It can be accessed from PioneerWeb – Employee tab – Administrative Processes – Pioneer Travel & Expense Log In. The login information is a faculty member's DU email and PioneerWeb password.

Faculty seeking reimbursement for travel, professional development, or other expenses should keep all itemized receipts and upload them to Concur. Faculty must then create and submit an expense report. Ideally, expense reports should be submitted within 30 days of purchase or travel. Electronic receipts can be emailed to receipts@concur.com; physical receipts can be scanned and emailed.

Faculty have the option of submitting their own reports or allowing the Office Manager to compile a report for them. If the latter, please bring the itemized receipts to the Office Manager. They will compile the report and notify you when it's ready for submission. By university policy, faculty must submit the prepared reports themselves at that last stage.

Questions about Concur can be directed to the Office Manager; there are also a variety of trainings on the Shared Services portal accessible via PioneerWeb. New faculty should speak with the Office Manager about attending a Concur training program.

Declining Balance Cards

Declining balance cards are University of Denver credit cards with a fixed balance. For the Writing Program, this is $1500 or the remainder of your professional development funds. Declining balance cards are a useful way to make professional development purchases without the strain on faculty finances. However, faculty are responsible for completing expense reports within 30 days of every purchase, familiarizing themselves with all purchasing policies, and making sure they don't overspend their professional allowance. Faculty can speak with the Office Manager to request a card. These reset at the end of each fiscal year.

University Grants for Scholarship

Faculty in the Writing Program are eligible for research grants of up to $3000 through the Faculty Research Fund or FRF, and several have successfully earned these in the past to support travel and other costs relevant to individual research. According to the Faculty Research Fund Portfolio page: "Faculty Research Fund grants aim to stimulate research, scholarship and creative activity by the University of Denver Faculty. This program targets smaller projects with grants of up to $3000 for actual costs incurred. Appointed faculty from all units are encouraged to apply. Proposals are accepted in two rounds, Fall and Spring."

Since a Writing Program Senator has sat on the committee that awards these grants for four years, we can offer the following insights into the selection process. Successful applications have tended to include:

1. A clear justification of how this research contributes significantly to the researcher's field (as distinct from curriculum development).
2. A research plan that justifies all its parts. So for instance, explaining why participants would

need to be paid; explaining why those particular participants are key to the project; if it involves travel, explaining why that work couldn't be done by Skype or email; etc.

3. Feasibility information. The committee needs to be convinced that your project scope and/or timeline is sufficient to learn what you claim you want to learn and that you will actually be able to complete it within the time frame of two years with the resources requested (unless you have access to outside funds, in which case you should mention these—particularly if it seems unlikely that your FRF grant would be sufficient to allow you to complete the project).
4. A specific and detailed budget. Don't just request $3000 because that is the maximum that is available. Be as specific as you can in your budget, and explain why each part will cost what it will.
5. DU's advantage in funding your work. Framing your work as broadening and strengthening DU's reputation nationally can be valuable.
6. Accessible style. Proposals should avoid extremely technical or disciplinary jargon and should be written for an audience of educated non-experts.

For other potential grant sources, faculty should consult The Office of Teaching and Learning (OTL) and The Center for Community Engagement and Service Learning (CCESL). Historically, OTL has offered grants for teaching, developing online and hybrid courses, and mini-grants for implementing new technology. CCESL consistently offers grants for the public good that fund service-learning, civic engagement, and community-based learning and research projects. Faculty interested in these grants should consult the websites for OTL, https://otl.du.edu/, and CCESL, https://www.du.edu/ccesl/. Many Writing Program colleagues have received these grants and can help you with the process.

Shared Services (Human Resources)
The Shared Services Center takes care of human resources issues like payroll, benefits, and reimbursement. You might also need to refer to them if you are contracting with vendors or conducting related kinds of campus-related business. They are located a few blocks east and south of the main campus, at 2601 East Colorado Avenue. For more information, consult their website at https://www.du.edu/sharedservices/.

Useful Contacts on Campus
IT Help Center: 1-4700
Classroom Tech Support: 1-3595
AAC Classroom Support: 1-2469
Daniels College of Business tech support: 1-2240.
Digital Production Services: 1-6501
Shared Services/Payroll: 1-7420 | sharedservices@du.edu
Benefits: 1-7420 | totalrewards@du.edu
Parking: 1-3210 | parking@du.edu

Calendar Deadlines
The following are general deadlines. The Executive Director, Assistant Director, or Office Manager will communicate the precise deadlines via the Charleslamb-l listserv and/or on the Writing Program website.

Last Thursday in September: Class Schedule Preference Form
The Assistant Director will send a link to the online preference form. If you are interested in teaching a special section including Online, Hybrid, Honors, or Advanced courses, please indicate this preference on the form. If you have questions, email the Assistant Director. The preference form will be for both winter and spring quarters

First Thursday in October): Winter Course Descriptions Due
The Assistant Director will send a request for you to provide a 100-word course description of any course you are teaching. This will be posted on the Banner course schedule and as a PDF on the Writing Program website.

First Thursday in October: Winter Book Orders Due to Bookstore

Mid-January: Spring Course Descriptions Due

Mid-January: Spring Book Orders Due to Bookstore

Last week of January: FSEM course interest
Send an email to the Executive Director indicating your interest in teaching an FSEM course before submitting a proposal to Undergraduate Studies (Leah O'Grady). This extra step allows us to properly schedule courses.

Last Week of January: Writing Minor course proposals
Send the proposal via email to the Steering Committee.

Other Deadlines
The CFP for FSEM proposals usually goes out the first week of February. Contact Leah O'Grady (leah.ogrady@du.edu) for more information.

There is a rolling CFP for ASEM proposals: September 1 (for Winter), November 1 (for Spring), and January 15 (for Summer or Fall). Contact Doug Hesse for more information.

Appendix 1: Program Timeline

2005	Writing Program founded
July 1, 2006	Doug Hesse hired as founding Director of the Writing Program
	Doug hires Eliana Schonberg as founding Director of the Writing Center, Amy Kho as Office Manager, and 19 lecturers.
November 2-3, 2006	Writing Center Grand Opening. Day of programming, with lecture by Neal Lerner, MIT, to speak on "Science Labs, Writing Labs: Provocative Parallels"
March 2, 2007	Writing Program hosts Michael Bérubé, Penn State, for "Writing as a Public Intellectual" talk.
April 12, 2007	Writing Program hosts Victor Villanueva, Washington State, to speak on "Rhetorics of the New Racism"
May 10-11, 2007	Anne Wysocki and Dennis Lynch, Michigan Tech, give talk on "The Dismissed: on the pasts and potential futures of emotion and the visual in writing studies"
September 20, 2007	Writing Program hosts Open Mic Night
September 27, 2007	Writing Program brings to campus Cheryl Glenn, Penn State University, to discuss "Feminist Engagements with Rhetoric: The Possibilities"
October 18, 2007	Paul Kei Matsuda, Arizona State University, gives talk "Multilingual Writers in the University: Some Strategies for Teachers"
January 1, 2008	Program receives CCCC Certificate of Excellence
January 24, 2008	Writing Program hosts Michael Palmquist, Colorado State University, to present "reload|reset|reboot: Rethinking the Role of Computers in Writing Instruction"
April 8, 2008	Researchers as Writers	Writers as Researchers lecture series.
April 16, 2008	Researchers as Writers	Writers as Researchers lecture series.
April 24, 2008	Rosa Eberly, Penn State University, speaks on "Quantum Parliaments: Rhetoric, Disciplinarity, and Sustainable Publics"
April 29, 2008	Researchers as Writers	Writers as Researchers lecture series.
May 1, 2008	Researchers as Writers	Writers as Researchers lecture series.
May 5, 2008	Researchers as Writers	Writers as Researchers lecture series.
May 5, 2008	Writing Program hosts Phillip Pardi, Bard College, for Poetry Reading from Meditations on Rising and Falling
May 12, 2008	Open Mic Night at the Botanic Gardens. Theme: Urban Nature"
May 14, 2008	Researchers as Writers	Writers as Researchers lecture series.
July 6-13, 2008	Writing Program hosts the annual WPA Conference, Workshop, & Institutes
October 31, 2008	How do College Students Develop and Transfer Writing Abilities? A Campus-Wide Symposium
April 22, 2009	Conversations in the Disciplines: Approaches to Research. Research Panel 1 with Dr. Tom Knecht, Dr. Ingrid Tague, and Dr. Joan Winn.
April 22, 2009	Power in the Blood: Book Signing. Dr. Linda Tate, Writing Program Lecturer read from her recently published book and then signed copies afterwards.
April 27, 2009	Conversations in the Disciplines: Approaches to Research. Research Panel 2 with Dr. Ann Dobyns, Dr. Robert Dores, and Dr. Christina Kreps.
May 6, 2009	Rhetoric, Pedagogy, and Civic Responsibility, reception and lecture by Prof. Gerard Hauser, University of Colorado at Boulder

May 19, 2009	"Composition Saves the World" and "Spinoza, Burgh, and Jewish Rhetoric. Patricia Bizzell, Holy Cross University. Visit co-sponsored with Judaic Studies.
2010	Writing Program receives additional lecturer line.
February 23, 2010	Writing Program Faculty Lecture Series: "Striking a Chord and a Nerve: The Rhetoric of Reproductive Rights and Motherhood in and around the Work of Ani DiFranco." – Jennifer Campbell
September 2010	Megan Kelly and Brad Benz join faculty
October 20, 2010	National Day on Writing. PostSecret Table, Breakfast Celebrating DU First-Year Writers, Writing Center Variety Hour, DU Writers Read.
2011	Writing Program receives 3 additional lecturer lines.
January 2011	Juli Parrish joins the faculty
April 12-13, 2011	Conversations in the Disciplines featuring Danny McIntosh, Seth Masket, Joan Winn, Hava Gordon, Bonnie Clark, William Philpott
September 2011	Liz Drogin, Eric Leake, and Kara Taczak join faculty
2012	Writing Program receives 2 additional lecturer lines
2012	Writing Program receives the Community-Engaged Department of the Year Award from the Center for Community Engagement and Service Learning (CCESL).
February 2012	Joe Harris, Duke University, visits campus to speak about "Using Student Writing"
April 11, 2012	Conversations in the Disciplines. Speakers: Michael Kinyon, Mathematics; Christina Foust, Communication Studies; William Philpott, History.
Spring 2012	1st Edition of WRIT Large is launched
September 2012	Cydney Alexis, Amber Engelson, Lance Massey, Lauren Picard, Angela Sowa, and Melissa Tedrowe join faculty
October 3, 2012	Debate Fest – Program produced "Debate Bingo" cards that go viral nationally
October 9, 2012	Quick Lunch Lecture Workshop: "Responding to Writing While Saving Some Weekend."
October 12, 2012	Kathleen Blake Yancey Lecture: "The View from a Rear View Mirror."
October 17, 2012	Quick Lunch Lecture Workshop: "Getting Students Beyond Quotation and Summary."
October 18, 2012	National Day on Writing. Featuring a Twitter Story Contest and Writing on Stage event.
October 19, 2012	Quick Lunch Lecture Workshop: "Responding to Writing While Saving Some Weekend."
October 23, 2012	Quick Lunch Lecture Workshop: "What Students Like Best."
October 30, 2012	Quick Lunch Lecture Workshop: "Getting Students Beyond Quotation and Summary."
October 31, 2012	Quick Lunch Lecture Workshop: "Multimodal Writing Assignments."
November 2, 2012	Quick Lunch Lecture Workshop: "What Students Like Best."
November 8, 2012	Quick Lunch Lecture Workshop: "Multimodal Writing Assignments."
2013	Liz Drogin wins the Service Learning Faculty Member of the year award from CCESL.
January 30, 2013	WRIT Large (2nd Ed.) Launch and Reading.
April 16-17, 2013	Conversations in the Disciplines featuring: Lindsay Feitz, Gender and Women's Studies; Anne DePrince, Psychology; Peter Hanson, Political Science; Kristin Taavola, Music. Robert Dores, Biological Sciences; Juli Parrish, Writing; Ophir Sefiha, Sociology and Criminology.

May 9, 2013	Writing Program hosts 1st annual COMPosium
September 2013	Allan Borst, April Chapman-Ludwig, and Sarah Hart Micke join faculty
October 15, 2013	Writing Program faculty invite students for afternoon snack and information in "Food For Thought…About First-Year Writing."
October 24, 2013	Writing Out of Bounds: A Community Writing Center Celebration featuring readings by writers from DU and community writing centers.
October 25, 2013	A Conversation with Hampton Sides. Reading and conversation with journalist and writer.
October 29, 2013	Early Works: A Celebration of FSEM Writing event.
February 11, 2014	Writing Program hosts 1st annual "Writing in Public" event, with speakers Dylan Scholinski, Rachel Kleinfeld, and Peter Banda.
February 19, 2014	3rd Edition of WRIT Large is launched
April 22-23, 2014	Conversations in the Disciplines featuring Dr. Anna Sher, Dr. Eleanor McNees, Dr. Sandy Lee Dixon.
May 15, 2014	Writing Program hosts 2nd annual COMPosium
September 2014	Rob Gilmor and Polly Reid join faculty
October 9, 2014	Writing Program brings author Ted Conover to campus for talk
October 14, 2014	Writing Program hosts advising event: Food For Thought to help students make the most of First-Year Writing classes.
October 16, 2014	Faculty Workshop: Qualitative Research and Writing. The Writing program hosted Dr. Jared Del Rosso (Department of Sociology & Criminology), Dr. Christina Kreps (Department of Anthropology) and Dr. Kate Willink (Department of Communications) to discuss qualitative research methods and writing practices across the disciplines.
November 5, 2014	FSEM COMPosium: The Early Works. A celebration of first-year student writing and research.
November 6, 2014	Faculty Workshop: Quantitative Research and Writing. The Writing Program hosted Dr. Becky Powell (Department of Geography) and Dr. Michelle Knowles (Department of Chemistry) to discuss quantitative research methods and how they applied to writing in the
November 14, 2014	Writing the Range conference with plenary speakers Scott Wible & Jess Enoch, U. of Maryland
January 6, 2015	Lauren Salvador begins as Office Manager
February 10, 2015	2nd annual Writing in Public event, with speakers Dylan Scholinski, Sarah Plummer Taylor, and Kim Manajek.
Spring 2015	4th Edition of WRIT Large is launched
April 23, 2015	Conversations in the Disciplines with Donald Bacon, Alejandro Ceron, Susan Schulten
May 2015	WP Faculty unanimously approve new faculty review and promotion guidelines.
2015	Heather Martin wins the Service Learning Faculty Member of the year award from CCSEL
July 1, 2015	Eliana Schonberg leaves DU for a position at Duke. Juli Parrish takes over as Interim Director of Writing Center. Sarah Hart Micke begins as Assistant Director of Writing Center
September 1, 2015	Brad Benz, Jennifer Campbell, Richard Colby, David Daniels, Matt Hill, Kamila Kinyon, Heather Martin, Juli Parrish, Casey Rountree, Carol Samson, Blake Sanz, Rebekah Shultz Colby, Geoff Stacks, John Tiedemann appointed as Teaching Associate Professors.
September 1, 2015	Dan Singer joins faculty
January 2016	Carol Samson granted Emeritus status

February 2016	5th edition of WRIT Large is published
February 23, 2016	Author D.T. Max gives talk on David Foster Wallace
April 29, 2016	2nd Annual Writing the Range Conference with plenary speakers Cheryl Ball (U. of Virginia) and Kate Vieira (U. of Wisconsin)
May 2016	Writing Program receives additional faculty line. Keith Rhodes, David Riche, and Libby Catchings join faculty. Juli Parrish is hired as Director of the Writing Center.
May 18, 2016	COMPosium
June 15, 2016	ASEM/FSEM Workshop
September 1, 2016	Megan Kelly appointed Teaching Associate Professor
October 19, 2016	1st Annual Encountering Stories Showcase
November 9, 2016	Short History of Student Writing Exhibit
February 10, 2017	Talk by Patricia Roberts-Miller (U. of Texas): Rhetoric of Demagoguery
April 5, 2017	6th edition of WRIT Large launched
April 19, 2017	Conversations in the Disciplines with Michael Brent, Ana Babic Rosario, Elizabeth Sperber, Barry Zink
June 15, 2017	Future of College Writing Symposium with speakers Eileen Schell (Syracuse); John Duffy (Notre Dame); Linda Adler-Kassner (U. California, Santa Barbara)
September 1, 2017	Kara Taczak appointed Teaching Associate Professor
September 1, 2017	Aubrey Schiavone and Zoe Tobier join faculty
October 18, 2017	Encountering Stories Showcase
February 12, 2018	Writing in Public with speakers Becky Lee, Nickolas Dawkins, & Jessica Campbell-Swanson
February 14, 2018	Frederick Douglas Transcribe-A-Thon
April 2018	7th edition WRIT Large launched
April 17, 2018	Conversations in the Disciplines with Kristy Ulibarri, Alejandro Ceron, Mei Yin.
July 20-21, 2018	Hosted CCCC Regional Summer Conference
October 10, 2018	Writers@Work series – Jen Reeder
November 7, 2018	Writers@Work series – Mindy Sink
December 5, 2018	Writing Program retreat @ Lookout Mountain
February 5, 2019	Writers@Work series – Rob Blume
February 13, 2019	Writers@Work series – Larry Goldman
February 14, 2019	Frederick Douglass Day Transcribe-a-thon
February 20, 2019	Writers@Work series – Savannah Barry
February 27, 2019	Writers@Work series – Ryan Ellis
April 16, 2019	Writers@Work series – Angie Thurston
April 22, 2019	Conversations in the Disciplines
April 24, 2019	Writers@Work series – John Campbell
May 9, 2019	Writers@Work series – Andrea Dupree
June 19, 2019	Faculty vote approves revisions to the Reappointment & Promotion guidelines
June 17-21, 2019	Writing Institute for 20 DU faculty across the curriculum
June 23-26, 2019	Program hosts WAC Institute (40 professor from across the country)
June 27th, 2019	Writing Retreat at the American Mountaineering Center in Golden
September 1, 2019	7 Writing Program faculty promoted to Teaching Professor: Brad Benz, Jennifer Campbell, Richard Colby, David Daniels, Heather Martin, Juli Parrish, Rebekah Shultz Colby

Appendix 2: Standing Committee Service

Year	Steering 2-year terms, rotating so that 2 new people come in each year. Bold= new term starting	Outreach	Professional Development	WRIT
2006-7		Mindy Williams, David Daniels, Kamila Kinyon, Geoffrey Bateman, Heather Martin, Doug Hesse – ex-officio	Blake Sanz, Jeff Ludwig, Linda, Carol Samson, Doug Hesse-ex officio	Jennifer Campbell, Richard Colby, Rebekah Shultz Colby,
2007-8		**WAC** Richard Colby, Alba Newmann, Jennifer Novak, Geoff Stacks, Kelli Custer, Doug Hesse (ex officio)		**First-Year Writing** Jennifer Campbell, Richard Colby, Rebekah Shultz Colby, **Research and Assessment** Jennifer Campbell, Richard Colby, Kelli Custer, Rebekah Shultz Colby,
2008-9	**Geoffrey Bateman, Richard Colby, Alba Newmann, Jennifer Novak, Doug Hesse, Eliana Schonberg** (ex officio)			Jennifer Campbell (chair?), Jeff Ludwig, Matt Hill?, Casey Rountree?
2009-10	Richard Colby, **Kelli Custer**, Alba Newmann Holmes, **John Tiedemann**, Doug Hesse, Eliana Schonberg (ex officio)			Jennifer Campbell (chair), Richard Colby, Kelli Custer, Kamila Kinyon, Jeff Ludwig, Casey Rountree, Geoff Stacks
2010-11	Kelli Custer, **David Daniels, Heather Martin,** John Tiedemann, Eliana Schonberg (ex	Matt Hill (chair), Geoffrey Bateman, Kelli Custer, Megan Kelly, Carol Samson,	Blake Sanz (chair), Juli Parrish, Brad Benz, David Daniels, Alba Newmann Holmes, Heather Martin, Geoff Stacks, Mindy Williams	Richard Colby (chair), Jennifer Campbell, Kamila Kinyon, Rebekah Shultz Colby, April Chapman-Ludwig, Casey Rountree

Year						
	officio), Doug Hesse					
2011-12	David Daniels, Heather Martin, **Juli Parrish, Mindy Williams,** Eliana Schonberg (ex officio), Doug Hesse	Mindy Williams, Heather Martin, Geoffrey Bateman, Eliana Schonberg, Eric Leake, Alba Newmann Holmes, Megan Kelly		Kelli Custer (chair), Richard Colby, Jennifer Campbell, Liz Drogin, Geoff Stacks, John Tiedemann		Rebekah Shultz Colby, Kara Taczak, Casey Rountree, Kamila Kinyon, Matt Hill, Juli Parrish, Brad Benz, April Chapman-Ludwig
2012-13	**Matt Hill, Rebekah Shultz Colby,** Juli Parrish, Mindy Williams, Eliana Schonberg (ex officio), Doug Hesse	**Campus & Community Outreach** Matt Hill, Eric Leake, Geoff Stacks, Melissa Tedrowe, LP Picard	**Student Pubs** Eliana Schonberg, David Daniels, Heather Martin, Carol Samson, Cydney Alexis	**Disciplinary Knowledge** Kamila Kinyon, Lance Massey, John Tiedemann, Mindy Williams		**Curriculum & Assessment** Jennifer Campbell, Rebekah Shultz Colby, Richard Colby, Angie Sowa	**Teaching Support & Resources** Amber Engelson, Juli Parrish, Casey Rountree, Kara Taczak
2013-14	Matt Hill, **Blake Sanz,** Rebekah Shultz Colby, **Kara Taczak,** Eliana Schonberg (ex officio), Doug Hesse	**Outreach** Melissa Tedrowe, Lauren Picard, Carol Samson, David Daniels, Geoff Stacks, Megan Kelly, John Tiedemann, Eliana Schonberg		Juli Parrish, Allan Borst, Matt Hill, Lance Massey		Angie Sowa, Jennifer Campbell, Casey Rountree, April Chapman-Ludwig, Rebekah Shultz Colby	Blake Sanz, Sarah Hart Micke, Kamila Kinyon, Amber Engelson
2014-15	**Sarah Hart Micke, Juli Parrish,** Blake Sanz, Kara Taczak, Eliana Schonberg (ex officio), Doug Hesse	Lauren Picard, Carol Samson, David Daniels, Geoff Stacks, Megan Kelly,		Juli Parrish, Angie Sowa, Allan Borst, Matt Hill		April Chapman-Ludwig, Jennifer Campbell, Richard Colby, Rebekah Shultz Colby, Kara Taczak	Rob Gilmor, Amber Engelson, Sarah Hart Micke, Kamila Kinyon
2015-16	**Allan Borst, Rob Gilmor,** Sarah Hart Micke, Heather Martin, Juli Parrish (ex officio), Doug Hesse	**Curriculum & Teaching** Polly Reid, Matt Hill, Casey Rountree, Richard Colby, Rob Gilmor:	**Student Engagement Beyond Classes** Kamila Kinyon, Dan Singer, Sarah Hart Micke	**Promotion & Reappointment** Jennifer Campbell, Kara Taczak, Geoff Stacks	**Faculty Engagement** Brad Benz, April Chapman-Ludwig, Rebekah Shultz Colby, Juli Parrish	**WRIT Large** Megan Kelly, LP Picard, David Daniels, Heather Martin	
2016-17	**Angie Sowa, Lauren Picard**, Doug Hesse, Juli Parrish,	**Visibility & Curation** April Chapman-Ludwig, Matt Hill,	**Events** Geoff Stacks, Keith Rhodes, Megan Kelly, Carol	**Curriculum & Assessment** Kara Taczak, Richard Colby, David Daniels, Libby Catchings, Casey Rountree, Polly Reid, Angie Sowa		**Writing Center Resource** Brad Benz, Blake Sanz, David Riche,	

	Heather Martin	John Tiedemann, Dan Singer, Rebekah Shultz Colby, Allan Borst	Samson, LP Picard, Heather Martin		Sarah Hart Micke, Juli Parrish, Rob Gilmor	
2017-18	**Keith Rhodes, Rebekah Shultz Colby**, Angie Sowa, Lauren Picard, Doug Hesse, Juli Parrish	*V& C* Aubrey Schiavone, Zoe Tobier, Dan Singer, April Chapman-Ludwig, Rebekah Shulz Colby	**Events** Kamila Kinyon, Geoff Stacks, David Daniels, LP Picard, Keith Rhodes	**Curriculum & Assessment** Richard Colby, Polly Reid, David Riche, Casey Rountree, Libby Catchings, Angie Sowa	**Writing Center Resource** Sarah Hart Micke, Megan Kelly, Heather Martin, Juli Parrish	
2018-19	**Rob Gilmor, David Riche,** Keith Rhodes, Rebekah Shultz Colby, Doug Hesse, Juli Parrish			**Curriculum & Assessment** Richard Colby, Polly Reid, David Riche, Casey Rountree,		

Appendix 3: Historical Initiatives

Longitudinal Study of Writing. A four-year longitudinal study of 10% of the class of 2010 began in spring 2007. In spring 2007, we began collecting data from a group of first-year students at the University of Denver whose writing, writing experiences, and writing attitudes we would follow and interpret until graduation. Our goals were fairly open-ended: describe the amounts and kinds of writing and writing experiences of DU undergrads and interpret the effects and implications of what we learned. From all the students enrolled in WRIT 1133, the spring-quarter required writing course, we randomly selected 130 students whom we invited to participate in the study. About 95 of them came to an information meeting, and 81 of them enrolled. We then invited a second, randomly selected cohort of 38 students enrolled in First-Year Seminars in fall 2008. In exchange for a $75 honorarium paid each quarter (increased to $95 in years 3 and 4), participants agreed to complete a quarterly questionnaire, upload writings, and be interviewed annually. About 75 students provided data for 7 or more quarters. In the end, however, 44 of the spring 2007 cohort completed the study.

Error Analysis. In the fall of 2007, we analyzed errors in a random sample of 215 papers from a corpus of 700 papers written by first-year students at the University of Denver, using a taxonomy mainly based on work by Andrea Lunsford and Robert Connors. Papers came from a wide range of courses across the disciplines at DU; none came from writing or composition courses. These 215 papers contained 330,803 words, in 17,606 sentences, an average of 18.79 words per sentence, an average paper length of 1538.6 words. Ten trained raters, all professors in the DU writing program, analyzed and reported errors. One finding is that students made an average of 1.5 errors per 100 words. This counters conventional lore that student writing is rife with error.

Writing in the Majors Project. In the fall of 2007, the University Writing Program undertook the Writing in the Majors Project (WIMP) to gain a clearer understanding of writing practices and expectations across campus. Generally speaking, this project sought, working with faculty from various departments, to provide descriptions of (rather than to give suggestions regarding) writing by students within particular majors. Toward this end, syllabi were gathered, sample student writing was reviewed, faculty and student surveys were administered, and faculty and students were interviewed. Undergraduate students from each major were also selected to gather research. They were provided a small stipend in order to become a member of each research team, and they contributed to the data by interviewing classmates in their major.

Out of the projects emerged a series of reports between 15-30 pages, a copy of which was delivered to the respective departments, and a copy of which is housed in the Writing Program. Departments who agreed to collaborate in these projects included History, Economics, Philosophy, Music, Communications, Chemistry, Religious Studies, and Political Science.

Electronic Portfolio Research. From 2008 to 2011, a team of Writing Program faculty participated in Cohort V of the Inter/ National Coalition for Electronic Portfolio Research. Team members learned more about the use of ePortfolios in composition and conducted several research projects to answer questions about how we can use our WRIT portfolios to foster student learning and professional development. We shared our findings with the faculty and with

our coalition peers at regular cohort meetings. Our final report to the coalition, along with a number of documents and presentations related to the initiative, is available under the Electronic Portfolio Research tab on the Writing Program Portfolio site.

ESL Initiatives and Enhanced Sections of WRIT 1122 and 1133. In the 2010-2011 academic year, the Writing Program responded to a campus-wide need to support DU's first-year international students. In the winter quarter of 2011 we piloted several sections of "WRIT 1122 I"; we continued offering these as pilot courses in the winter of 2012. These courses are independent of the DU English Language Center.

Prior to the fall registration periods, the Writing Program sends out an informational document to FSEM teachers and advisors, which provided guidelines for identifying which non-native speakers would benefit most from the WRIT 1122 I sections. In recent years, the International section enrollments have been declining, and program is considering alternatives to this model.

WRIT 1122 I
WRIT 1122 I fulfills the same course goals and contains the same course features as WRIT 1122, but it also offers the following enhancements:
- WRIT 1122 I meets three days a week, including a Friday session (MWF or TRF).
- Two or three Writing Fellows, drawn from consultants at the University Writing Center were embedded in each section of WRIT 1122 I.

  The responsibilities, work expectations, and compensation for University Writing Center Fellows and WRIT 1122 I instructors were as follows:
  Instructors:
- created and led a training workshop for WC Fellows in December.
- received additional compensation for teaching these sections. They attended some, but not all, Friday class sessions.
- created their own syllabi and assignments and conducted all of the evaluations and grading of student work.

  University Writing Center Fellows:
- Attended the December training workshop.
- Attended three or four hours of the course each week, working individually with the students or with small groups of students.
- Worked up to 45 hours for the quarter, including in-class time and outside professional development and training.
- Continued to work additional shifts in the WC as Consultants, but due to possible conflicts, were asked to not work with WRIT 1122 I students who came to the WC.

WRIT 1122 I students completed the course and uploaded their WRIT 1122 I portfolios to the DU Portfolio site, just like other WRIT 1122 students.

WRIT 1133 I. After the success of the WRIT 1122 I pilot, in the spring of 2012 we piloted sections of WRIT 1133 I. Like the similarly designated 1122 sections, WRIT 1133 I sought to

serve international students and English Language Learners, while fulfilling the same course goals and containing the same course features as WRIT 1122; it also offered the following enhancements: WRIT 1133 I met three days a week, including a Friday session (MWF or TRF). Two or three Writing Fellows, drawn from consultants at the University Writing Center were embedded in each section of WRIT 1133 I.

Multimodal Writing Initiative. In the summer of 2009, Doug Hesse, Jennifer Campbell, David Daniels, Alba Newmann Holmes, and Jennifer Novak, funded by a CTL (now OTL) grant, formed a committee to research the state of multimodality in the field and explore options for integrating multimodal components in WRIT classes. The committee's research and suggestions were presented in a report that can be found on the Writing Program Portfolio site along with additional documents related to the initiative. Pilot multimodal sections of 1122 were offered in winter 2010. We conducted a pre- and post-survey to assess the pilot, and the survey results and analysis are also available on Portfolio. The committee determined that the program should continue to foster multimodal instruction and activities, but should not institute a program-wide multimodal requirement at this time. As an outgrowth of these efforts, Jennifer Campbell created the Multimodal Writing Resources wiki to host articles, technical resources, and assignment ideas for using multiple modes and media in WRIT courses.

Writing the Range Conference. On November 14th, 2014 the Writing Program was proud to host the Writing the Range Conference, a day of interaction about scholarship, pedagogy, and the profession with a special emphasis on issues concerning the Front Range writing community. Featured in this day-long symposium were keynote sessions with Jessica Enoch and Scott Wible from the University of Maryland, a research forum, and dynamic roundtable sessions that discussed such questions as: "What does it mean to write for the public good?" "What should be the nature of first-year writing and its relationship to larger curricula?" and "What roles can alternatives sites of writing and research play in college writing?" In the spring of 2016, the Writing Program hosted the second annual Writing the Range Conference and hosted Cheryl Ball and Catherine Vieira as guest speakers.

Writing Center Online Short Courses. In 2010-2011, three members of the faculty developed online short courses offered to both undergraduate and graduate students in the winter and spring: Writing an APA-Style Literature Review; Writing a Statement of Purpose for Your Law, Medical, or Graduate School Application; and Making Your Writing Flow, which was offered twice. In 2012, two additional members added short courses (on effective presentations and writing longer papers without adding fluff) to create a total of five short courses to be offered in winter and spring, some of them twice.

Hybrid Video Development. In summer 2015 Jennifer Campbell spearheaded an initiative to develop videos for hybrid and online WRIT 1133 classes. With topics such as creating a research space/asking good research questions, qualitative data analysis, calculating measures of central tendency in Excel, and editing for academic style, the goal is to produce a video library useful to colleagues across campus as well as the Writing Program.

Transfer of Transfer Project. Kara Taczak and Angie Sowa are participating in a multi-institutional research project, "The Transfer of Transfer," that addresses a need for

generalizability in transfer research in writing studies. As part of the study, Kara and Angie are conducting a set of four interviews over the course of a year (January 2015 – January 2016) and compiling a report for the writing program that outlines the ways in which our transfer of transfer curriculum has worked in 1122 and 1133.

College Application Video Essay. In the summer of 2016, Dan Singer piloted an inclusion/diversity project intended to increase college access and readiness among vulnerable student populations in Denver (particularly, first-gen. American students about to begin the college application process and/or first-gen. college applicants coming from diverse linguistic, cultural, and socio-economic communities) by developing a comprehensive one-week program on the use of multimodal composition in college applications. A group of 10 rising seniors and 4 teachers from Abraham Lincoln High School visited campus for a week to learn how to use multimodal composition as a college access tool—particularly, an emergent digital genre called the "college video application essay."

CCCC Regional Summer Conference. In July 20-21, 2018, the University of Denver Writing Program hosted a two-day CCCC Summer Regional conference. 208 people registered, coming from 36 states – and with video participants from Russia. The program featured 42 panels, 6 workshops, a Research/Teaching Forum, and a keynote speaker, approximately speakers 150 altogether. The conference Steering Committee included: Doug Hesse (chair), Brad Benz, Libby Catchings, Keith Rhodes, and Lauren Salvador. A detailed report/analyses of the event can be found on the Writing Program shared drive.