

CHAPTER 7

PART OF THE FABRIC OF THE UNIVERSITY: FROM FIRST YEAR THROUGH GRADUATE SCHOOL AND ACROSS THE DISCIPLINES

**Chris Thaiss, Sarah Perrault, Katharine Rodger,
Eric Schroeder, and Carl Whithaus**

University of California, Davis

INTRODUCTION: WHAT MAKES A WRITING PROGRAM TRULY INDEPENDENT?

Chris Thaiss

Though every writing program in U.S. higher education has its unique story, all these stories also have much in common because of our field's collective history over the past century or more—and because of the strength of our professional organizations and literature. That almost all writing programs in the US have been connected at some point to English departments is part of that collective history, as is the educational training of most U.S. writing program administrators, who achieved graduate degrees either in English literature programs or in English education programs run by schools of education. (For one historical example, see Gopen, this volume; for a more contemporary attempts to become independent, see Rhoades, et al., and Everett, this volume.) Only in the past 20 years or so has a percentage of writing program administrators come out of the doctoral programs in Writing Studies that are themselves not connected to English departments. But even in these programs the link between English literature training and writing program development is evident in the backgrounds of most of those who developed these freestanding Ph.D. programs. (See Lalicker, this volume, for an analysis of “independence” of writing programs within English departments).

Thus, when we look closely at “independent” U.S. writing programs, as in this anthology, it is crucial for us to ask ourselves these questions: In what ways are we actually independent of the influence of English departments? Is our

independence mainly an administrative choice at a given university, perhaps (1) because of the large size of the writing program, which makes a separate administration reasonable, or (2) a consequence of failed interpersonal relations and of battles over distribution of funds within competing subsets of the English department? Or does that separation go deeper: when the physical separation occurs—and more important, after it occurs—does it reflect an ineluctable disciplinary divide, a sense of mission and intellectual forces so different that re-joining these entities would make no sense?

If we can answer yes to this last question, then we should be able to identify in any specific instance that driving mission and those intellectual forces that operate within, and empower, that independent program. In the case of the University Writing Program of the University of California, Davis, we can trace how the *actual* separation of the UWP from the English Department began many years prior to the *de jure* separation in 2004. The official separation of the UWP from English was finalized by the Academic Senate after a four-year process, which included consultant visits by four well-known writing program administrators from research universities. In large part, creation of an independent writing program came about because of the, by then, many years' collaboration of the composition program faculty with faculty from many departments through thriving initiatives such as the Campus Writing Center and the WAC/WID workshop program, as described in this essay. The Academic Senate, supporting the composition program lecturers, moved for creation of an independent writing program as a way to protect the upper- and lower division curricula that had been established, as well as its faculty. (See the UWP website, <http://writing.ucdavis.edu/about/program-history-document-archive>, for documents important to the creation of this independent entity.)

We can trace how, since 2004, those seismic forces at work much earlier have taken the program in 10 years along *trajectories* that (1) have brought it closer to multiple disciplines powerful in its environment and (2) established its own disciplinary authority. In all, we can show that as the UWP has developed, it has become uniquely able and flexible to meet specific needs of the institution and its students in ways that only an independent program can. As you read the sections to follow, please keep in mind that only an independent program—able to make its own decisions about funding, hiring and promotion, curriculum, and building of new programs—could have developed as ours has in such a brief time.

TRAJECTORY 1: WAC/WID

Key to the development of the UWP at Davis as an independent program has been its many years' growth of a WAC/WID consciousness, and its steadily stron-

ger relationships with a broad range of disciplines. Although Davis has over its century-long history become a tier one research university across the arts, humanities, and social sciences, its land-grant mission and its location in California's agricultural heartland have made it best known for its undergraduate and Ph.D. programs in the sciences, engineering, and agriculture, and for its medical and veterinary schools. While still part of the English Department, as Eric Schroeder explains below, the writing program began cultivating relationships with these signature disciplines, and courses emerged out of this collaboration tailored to the needs of diverse majors. What became known in the 1980s as the "Campus Writing Center" was not a tutoring center, as the term "writing center" usually implies in the US, though not in Europe and elsewhere (Thaiss et al.), but a series of upper-level courses linked to courses in a range of specific disciplines.

Over 30 years the mission of the writing program became known as "writing in the disciplines and professions," with courses such as writing in history, writing in the biological sciences, writing in engineering, and writing in human development in the "disciplines" group (see also Gopen, Hjortshoj, MacDonald et al., and Schendel & Royer, in this volume for conceptually similar yet practically different incarnations of writing in the disciplines and professions). Courses such as writing in science, writing in the health professions, business and technical writing, law, and journalism comprised the "writing in the professions" group.

In terms of the emergence of an "independent" identity, this steady relationship-building meant that what was taught in these courses and *how writing was defined in them* became more and more identified with the diversity of disciplines in the university and less and less influenced by the typical mission and subjects of English departments. Moreover, while most of the faculty (all non-tenure-track lecturers before 2006) hired to teach these courses had backgrounds in English literature and the teaching of English composition, several influential faculty came from other disciplinary backgrounds. In hiring these teachers, these other-than-English qualifications were prized, because of the growing need to staff high-demand courses in the rhetorics of science, engineering, law, etc. Then, after they were hired, what the coordinators of the program required of new lecturers was their desire and ability to *add to their interdisciplinary range of such courses*. Those lecturers who became the backbone of the program were those who could learn to teach courses as different as writing in law and writing in science, efforts that would demand collaboration with versatile colleagues and with teachers in those diverse disciplines.

Furthermore, part of the cross-disciplinary drive of the writing program faculty was to be part of the evolving *national mission* of the WAC movement (e.g., Russell, 2002); namely, to interact with faculty in different fields to help them make their own uses of writing in teaching more effective and student-centered.

Quarterly WAC workshops and consultations for various departments and individual teachers became staples of the writing faculty's work, and so built up trust and reliance across the university. That all writing course faculty were cultivating this extra-departmental point of view meant that WAC at UC Davis was being managed and carried out by a cadre of consultants, not by a single "WAC person," as at most schools that had started programs in the 1980s (McLeod & Miraglia, 1997; also, Davies, this volume, delineates further advantages of distributed administration within writing programs).

Since the establishment of the UWP as a separate unit in 2004, this trajectory has become even more pronounced. Since 2006, the number of courses in "disciplines and professions" has roughly doubled. In 2009, the Writing Minor (now called the Professional Writing Minor) was begun, which opened up a writing credential for majors from across disciplines. The multi-course requirement of the minor has sparked an interest in more specialized courses (e.g., science journalism, investigative reporting, technical and professional editing, rhetoric of popular science, visual rhetoric). In addition, collaboration with the Office of Graduate Studies has led to multiple series of workshops and courses for graduate students from across the university, on such topics as publishing articles and writing dissertations.

TRAJECTORY 2: STEM AND THE DAVIS LAND-GRANT MISSION

Particularly influential in shaping this independent writing program has been UC Davis' signal role in California research, policy, attitudes, and practice in agriculture, medicine, and environmental affairs. UCD began in 1908 as the "University Farm" (Scheuring, 2001), an extension of the university's first campus in Berkeley. Located in the Central Valley, the agricultural heart of California, the University Farm carried out the UC's land-grant mission. Today, more than a century later, UC Davis retains this emphasis, even as it has also become a nationally-prominent research university in the social sciences, humanities, and arts.

This land-grant role means that UCD attracts a majority of students with ambitions for medical or veterinary careers or for careers in the physical or biological sciences or engineering. Our UWP upper-division writing classes are populated by students passionate about the work they see themselves doing after graduation; courses such as Business Writing, Technical Writing, Writing in Science, and Writing in the Health Professions keep adding sections, and we look for faculty with academic and work experience backgrounds in these fields. It also means that students are eager for instruction and practice in communicating with audiences outside academia. So, from a rhetorical standpoint, we can

construct courses and assignments that challenge students to reach diverse audiences on issues and research inquiries students care about.

There is strong synergy among the coursework they do with us and the opportunities students have to present their lab-based study at the annual Undergraduate Research Conference (up to 500 talks and posters), and to be published in our several student publications. For example, the *California Aggie*, the student newspaper, is managed and written by students who take our journalism courses; our own UWP annual, *Prized Writing*, attracts 400 submissions a year, of which we publish about 25, balanced between feature essays and popularly-oriented scientific and technical articles. This synergy reinforces the year-by-year development of the UWP as a unique disciplinary entity that partakes of and contributes to the characters of many research disciplines, essentially distinct from the interests and methods of an English literature department.

TRAJECTORY 3: LINGUISTIC DIVERSITY AND TRANSNATIONAL IDENTITY

Perhaps there is no better example of the distinctive identity of the Davis UWP than its recent role in the history of language politics at UC Davis. Admirably traced by Duane Leonard in his 2011 dissertation in linguistics, the history shows how the English department was willing for the Linguistics Department in the 1980s to develop and teach courses in ESL writing to what was already a high percentage of multilingual communicators. When the UWP became an independent program with its own permanent director in 2006, one of the first hires was a nationally prominent specialist in second language writing, Dana Ferris, who came in as associate director for the lower-division, supervising first-year writing. Ferris led a refocusing of the first-year program on training of our grad student teachers to work with a significantly multilingual student body, and developed research projects on the linguistic demographics of UWP students (Ferris & Thaiss, 2011).

When funding for the ESL instructors in linguistics was diminished in the economic crisis in 2008–09, the UWP became a key member of an “ESL Task Force” that formed to devise new policy and procedures. In late 2012, the UWP was asked by the university to take over the teaching of multilingual writers and to help develop new practices for integrating the rising numbers of international students, primarily from China, into the university. This transition is an ongoing work in progress, as the new program launched in Fall 2013, but for the first time there is true coordination at Davis between the teaching of writing in a translingual context and the lower and upper-level writing requirements that affect all students. That link can occur because, in the UWP, Davis has a distinct

academic unit that blends teaching and research in Writing Studies broadly considered—not just in the literacy of a particular language.

TRAJECTORY 4: UWP ALONG THE X AND Y AXES; THE DESIGNATED PH.D. EMPHASIS (DE) IN WRITING STUDIES

Trajectories 1 through 3 emphasize the *cross*-curricular mission of the UWP, which we might picture as moving along the X axis (see Table 7.1). But we have also described the trajectories of influence of the UWP affecting students and their teachers through the different *levels* of the curriculum, as represented along the Y axis. So the identity of the UWP is embodied in these movements both vertically and horizontally. As these trajectories have continued, not only have the influence and responsibilities of the UWP embraced more “area,” so to speak, but the diversity of these interactions has continued to shape the identity of the program, its collective sense of self. An example of these mutual influences is the character of the Ph.D.-level “designated emphasis” (DE) in Writing, Rhetoric, and Composition Studies (WRaCS), which is housed in the UWP and began in 2008.

Not a Ph.D. degree itself, WRaCS is an elective interdisciplinary concentration that focuses the studies of candidates from several affiliated Ph.D. programs at Davis: Education, Linguistics, English, Cultural Studies, Comparative Literature, Performance Studies, and Native American Studies. At some point, we may propose the WRaCS DE as a free-standing Ph.D. program, but thus far the mix of affiliated Ph.D. programs, courses, and faculty have served our diverse students very well. The 25 affiliated faculty of WRaCS come from the UWP and from these disciplines; they offer courses and dissertation direction to the roughly 25 students currently in the DE. Students fulfill the DE by taking theory-and-practice courses from lists in four core areas: research methods, literacies and rhetorics, pedagogies, and writing administration and assessment. Because of the diverse affiliations, students who have chosen WRaCS are wide-ranging in the foci of their research. Recent and current research topics of WRaCS students include, for example, writing placement practices at California state universities; sustainability of U.S. WAC/WID programs; the teaching of academic genres to recent immigrant students in California high schools; the rhetoric of fourteenth century Italian vernacular poetry; the teaching of English writing in South Korea; eportfolios and the idea of “transfer” of writing knowledge; multi-modal writing and rhetorics; writing and autism. Again, writing, broadly defined, is at the center of the DE, but the individual focus is shaped by the researcher and nurtured by the mix of faculty who guide the student.

The sections that follow, written by four other members of the UWP faculty, explore our past, present, and future in the UWP. (All five authors commented

Table 7.1: The UWP's Vertical and Horizontal Curriculum and Influence

Constituencies	Arts/Humanities	Social Sciences	Sciences & Engineering
Graduate School	Courses, workshops; DE in Writing Studies; tutoring by grad writing fellows	Courses, workshops; DE in Writing Studies; tutoring by grad writing fellows	Courses, workshops; DE in Writing Studies; tutoring by grad writing fellows
Upper-Level Undergrad	Required and elective courses (WID and WIP series); professional writing minor	Required and elective courses (WID and WIP); professional writing minor	Required and elective courses (WID and WIP); professional writing minor
Lower-Level Undergrad	Required and elective courses	Required and elective courses	Required and elective courses
Faculty/TAs	Workshops, consultations, courses	Workshops, consultations, courses	Workshops, consultations, courses

on the entire draft and helped the lead author to ensure its consistency in style.) Each section highlights particular features that underscore our distinctive disciplinary/cross-disciplinary identity. The next section, for example, shows how in the years between 1910 and 2004 the composition program within the English Department gradually built its own multi-course, multi-level identity, increasingly in cooperation with other disciplines.

Moreover, from the late 1960s onward, there grew an increasing distinction within the curriculum and within the university's conception of student writing. This distinction was between lower-division writing (first-year and sophomore courses numbered below 100 and taught primarily by graduate students in English) and upper-division writing (junior and senior courses numbered from 100 to 199 and taught almost exclusively by full-time lecturers hired for that purpose). The section describes steps in that gradual growth, and how collective initiative by lecturers in the composition program sparked multiple collaborations with other disciplines, thus laying the groundwork for the independence to come after 2000.

HISTORY OF THE UWP (1910–2004)

Eric Schroeder

The first English class on the UC Davis campus was a writing course offered in 1910 that the agriculture majors were required to take (Scheuring, 2001); an English literature course featuring agricultural themes was offered twelve years

later. By the 1940s all students at UC Davis were required to take three writing courses in their first year—Subject A, and English 1A and 1B. This requirement would remain until the 1960s. Subject A was a basic system-wide writing requirement, which students took if they failed the system-wide exam.

By the 1950s the English Department was also offering upper-division writing courses, including 106L, which was “[d]esigned to develop a clear, accurate, interesting style,” and English 106G, “Creative Writing.” In the 1960s, the department added English 20, Intermediate Composition, a course “[d]esigned primarily for non-majors who wish to improve their skills in expository writing; the content of the course includes basic principle of rhetoric and rules of usage in present-day English.” At the upper division, 106L was renamed 103 and its description was broadened: “Survey of prose styles, the principles of prose rhetoric, and the usage patterns of present-day English grammar.”

One other significant change occurred near the end of the 1960s—faculty who wished to do so could offer special sections of advanced composition; these initially included offerings on legal writing and scientific writing. These courses were the first evidence of the “writing in disciplines and professions” concept that would come to distinguish the UWP in later years, as we describe in the rest of this section.

In 1968 the College of Letters and Sciences (L&S) dropped the requirement of three first-year courses. L&S required only that students take Subject A since it was a system-wide requirement; the other courses were replaced by a writing examination that students would take at the end of their sophomore year.

However, the decision that L&S made to reduce the lower-division writing requirements didn’t work out as planned, since students in unexpected numbers failed the exam. Under the existing regulations, there wasn’t a plan in place to address this failure. The college coped by allowing students who failed the exam to take a second course in lieu of passing the exam. In 1975–76, L&S specified that students could take 103 as one of the two courses. This clarification was the first step towards an upper-division writing requirement.

By the late 1970s UC Davis had one of the strongest composition programs in the UC system. This strength was the result of three developments. First, the L&S and Engineering writing requirements were modified one final time by 1980 so that students were required to take an upper-division course (or pass an exam) as well as complete a lower-division course. The second development was that the English Department formalized the experimentation that had occurred earlier when faculty elected to teach specialized sections of 103; the following advanced courses were added to the curriculum: English 103A, General Composition; 103B, Legal Writing, 103C, Article Writing (feature writing for mag-

azines and newspapers); 103E, Composition for Secondary Teachers; and 104, Scientific Writing.

The third development that contributed to the strength of UC Davis composition was the creation of the Campus Writing Center (CWC) in 1982. The CWC was funded and supervised independently of the English Department and charged with improving writing across all departments at UC Davis—*hence, the first explicit recognition of the writing program's WAC/WID identity.*

It was to meet that charge in two ways: by offering English 102 courses (“adjunct” writing classes paired with specific classes in other departments) and by offering writing workshops for faculty interested in improving the writing assignments in their courses and for TAs (and faculty) on assessing and responding to student papers. The CWC was not a student tutorial program, which developed separately as a service offered by the Learning Skills Center at UC Davis.

Because of the upper-division writing requirements, UC Davis, by the early 1980s, had a robust offering of writing courses and a cadre of lecturers who mostly taught these upper-division offerings. (The English Department had a large number of teaching assistants who taught the lower-division courses, but graduate students were rarely allowed to teach at the upper level.) As part of the English Department, the composition program tended to recruit lecturers who had Ph.D.s in literature, but most of these faculty began a process of reinvention once they were hired at Davis; they recognized that if they were going to be successful in their new positions, they did indeed need to remake themselves into writing specialists rather than literary scholars. Specialization took several forms.

For instance, the Subject A course came to be taught primarily by lecturers since it was believed that this course required more expertise than English 1, the standard expository writing course. (Experienced teaching assistants—then exclusively graduate students from the English Department—were also assigned to teach in the program.) Conversely, very few of the lecturers taught what had become the two main choices students used to fulfill their lower-division writing requirement: English 1 and English 3, the introduction to literature class. These classes were mostly taught by graduate student instructors.

During the 1980s, the lecturers hired to teach in the Campus Writing Center (typically a half-time appointment matched by a half-time appointment in the English Department or Subject A) frequently had demonstrated an interdisciplinary approach to their doctoral work, or had additional work experience in technical or grant writing, or had taught technical or specialized writing courses in other schools, or had an undergraduate or master's degree in a field other than literature. Some lecturers reported that their knowledge of writing in other fields

increased rapidly as they taught an English 102 paired with a class in another department; or when they conferred with faculty and TAs about evaluating writing in other disciplines, whether that writing was lab reports, technical abstracts, reviews of literature, or term papers.

Thus, in many respects the first-year composition program at UC Davis was like most others around the country. But at the advanced level, the writing program was almost unique. Not only was an upper-division course required, but the composition program also offered students a number of options for meeting this requirement.

Though the composition program was still part of the English Department, the broader university's commitment to a diversified writing curriculum contributed to the program's semi-autonomy. Instructors gradually gained more latitude about what to include in English 103A (Advanced Composition) and how to organize it, and many of them—influenced by the new national trend in the 1980s (see McLeod, 1988; McLeod & Soven, 2006)—used a writing-across-the-curriculum approach and often focused on reading from fields other than English. For those students who wanted to do something more specialized, the 103B–E series and the 104 course described above were available—these courses still form the core of our Writing in the Professions offerings.

Perhaps the most unusual thing about the curriculum was that set of courses—numbered 102—that were paired with individual courses in other disciplines. Students who enrolled in the writing courses had to be enrolled in the discipline course as well. But by 1982 program consensus recognized that these should be separate writing courses. Among the original English 102s were writing classes paired with courses in Engineering, Environmental Studies, Genetics, History, and Psychology. From the beginning, the flaw in this model was that the English 102 students were drawn from the students enrolled in the companion course—always a percentage of those students and seldom enough to fill the 25-student limit in the English 102 course. If the 102 course was paired with several courses in one department, in order to increase enrollment, it then became more like a “Writing in Psychology” or “Writing in History” course, not a pairing with a specific course.

Under this early formulation, ideally the CWC lecturers would arrange to meet the instructors of what were called the “content” courses a month or two before the quarter was to begin; the purpose of the meeting had a very practical basis—to secure from the instructor copies of the content course syllabus and assignments (email didn't exist and things always went missing in campus mail) and also perhaps discuss a scheme for publicizing the “adjunct” course to students enrolled in the content course. But sometimes these meetings were more than this—an opportunity for both instructors to share information about their

respective classes, perhaps discuss pedagogy, and for each to ask questions of the other regarding the other's course and its objectives.

This experience was particularly significant in terms of the CWC's mission to improve writing on the UC Davis campus, because it meant that the lecturers assigned to these courses had to reshape their teaching and research interests if they were going to accomplish that goal. And the need to branch out and learn the methods and conventions of other disciplines became even more apparent to those lecturers assigned to the WAC-inspired workshop program, generally three people a year with assignments averaging two to three years. All workshops were occasioned by requests from faculty across the disciplines at UCD. For undergraduates, faculty often requested workshops on how to write a particular kind of paper—lab reports, for instance, or research papers in history. For graduate students, workshops might focus on the process and mechanics of dissertation writing or, for TAs, how to comment effectively (and efficiently) on student papers. And sometimes faculty requested one-on-one consultations; the two basic types of consultations concerned designing effective writing assignments and the process of evaluating student writing. Since the lecturers teaching the English 102s and leading the workshops for the Campus Writing Center also had joint appointments in the English Department's Composition Program and Subject A, their developing knowledge of the genres, conventions, styles, and thinking in other disciplines gradually percolated into the content of all the other courses in the writing program.

Also shaping and professionalizing the writing program before independence in 2004 were several initiatives undertaken by lecturers. The first was the computer-assisted writing program in 1987. The Composition Program, the Registrar's Office, and the Office of Instructional Technology collaborated to dedicate a classroom to a computer-assisted writing curriculum. The room was to be used for 102s and 103s exclusively. The demand was such that new classrooms were soon added; today the UWP uses multiple computer classrooms in several buildings. Then in 1989 three lecturers began *Writing on the Edge* (WOE), a journal that focuses on writing and the teaching of writing. The editors' goal was to create a readable composition journal, or, as they put it at the time, "a cross between *College English* and *Rolling Stone*." WOE has persevered for 25 years and remains a respected journal in the field of Composition Studies.

Later than same year two lecturers began *Prized Writing* (<http://prizedwriting.ucdavis.edu>), an anthology of the best undergraduate writing at UC Davis. Undergraduates were invited to submit papers they wrote for any of their courses (with the exception of creative writing courses, since a separate publication already existed for poetry and fiction), and when final exams were complete

in spring, a group of lecturers got together to select the winners. The resulting publication was sold in the UC Davis bookstore and became a required text for numerous writing classes. Like *WOE*, *Prized Writing* remains an object of pride for the program.

HISTORY SINCE INDEPENDENCE: EXPANSION OF MISSION

Sarah Perrault and Katharine Rodger

The split from English precipitated a number of ongoing changes, but did not change the core concept of the undergraduate program, as our mission has intensified since independence (much like the developments described by Schendel & Royer, this volume). We remain heavily invested in teaching writing to students in all academic units through lower- and upper-division composition courses, to reaching out across campus via our Writing Across the Curriculum Team, and to the ongoing research and professional development that support both these missions. Nevertheless, independence has enabled rapid growth in response to the shifting needs of students and of our own unit. Some of the latter shifts include the addition of new faculty, of new classes, and of the Professional Writing Minor—which we are working to develop into a major—as well as our building of the Ph.D. emphasis in Writing, Rhetoric, and Composition Studies. Only independence has allowed such development.

THE UNDERGRADUATE WRITING CURRICULUM TODAY

With a combined annual enrollment of more than 7,000 students, the required undergraduate writing courses—lower and upper divisions—comprise the bulk of our program’s teaching presence on campus. Our FYW course, “Expository Writing” (UWP 1), enrolls approximately 2,700 students per academic year and is intended to teach students to meet “academic criteria that cross disciplinary boundaries” (Thaiss & Goodman, 2012, p. 459; see Ferris & Thaiss, 2011, for a discussion of changes in this course and of how its grad student instructors are mentored).

Lower-division—freshman and sophomore level—courses beyond UWP 1 include Popular Science and Technology Writing (UWP 11), Visual Rhetorics (UWP 12), Style in the Essay (UWP 18), Writing Research Papers (UWP 19), and Internship in Writing (UWP 92). While these classes are open to all majors, they typically enroll a large number of those completing the UWP Minor in Professional Writing, described below.

Advanced writing courses—those in our upper division sequences—have helped distinguish the UWP on the national scene. With more than 200 sec-

Table 7.2. Writing in the Disciplines and Writing in the Professions courses at UWP

Writing in the Disciplines	Writing in the Professions
UWP 102A Special Topics	UWP 104A Business Writing
UWP 102B Biological Sciences	UWP 104B Law
UWP 102C History	UWP 104C Journalism
UWP 102D International Relations	UWP 104D Elementary and Secondary Education
UWP 102E Engineering	UWP 104E Science
UWP 102F Food Science	UWP 104F Health
UWP 102G Environmental Writing	UWP 104I Internships
UWP 102H Human Development and Psychology	UWP 104T Technical Writing
UWP 102I Ethnic Studies	
UWP 102J Fine Arts	
UWP 102K Sociology	
UWP 102L Film Studies	

tions enrolling over 5,000 students per academic year (not including summer sessions), the UWP's upper division course offerings are robust, and continue to expand as the program evolves.

As of this writing, students can fulfill the university's upper division writing requirement with one of 20 courses, from the general Advanced Composition (UWP 101) to a selection of discipline- and profession-specific courses.

As described earlier, the UWP offers two focused series of upper division courses, Writing in the Disciplines (WID) and Writing in the Professions (WIP), comprised of classes specific to disciplinary and professional contexts. Our upper division courses teach students both to analyze and to produce the genres and forms of writing specific to field or future profession. As instructors, we design our classes to engage students with “transferable procedural knowledge aimed at helping students make connections across disciplines” (Miles et al., 2008, p. 507).

Our WID classes (sequenced as UWP 102A-L—see Table 7.2) require “concurrent enrollment in a specified course in a subject-matter discipline, acceptance into a specified major, or consent of the instructor” (UCD Catalog). As noted previously, a first group of WID classes were among the first specialized writing courses developed at UCD, and our expanding list continues to draw students seeking transferrable experience with discipline-specific writing.

Much larger numbers of students are drawn to the UWP's Writing in the Professions series (sequenced as UWP 104A-F, I, T), in which they “are intro-

duced to, and gain practice in, the kinds of writing they will do in a given profession” (UCD Catalog). Because students are not necessarily required to evidence concurrent enrollment or a major in a particular subject or discipline, the WIP course enrollments are significantly higher than those in the WID series (43 WIP sections were offered in Fall 2013, versus eight WID, for instance). As with any large program, there is variation in how classes are taught, but most WIP courses are designed to facilitate a form of transfer described as “generalization”: “Generalization includes classical interpretations of transfer—carrying and applying knowledge across tasks—but goes beyond them to examine individuals and their social organizations” (Wardle, 2007, p. 68). Students often work collaboratively, producing texts and projects not only to practice various genres and forms, but also to actively engage in understanding activity systems in which they function.

In one iteration of UWP 104E, *Writing in the Professions: Science*, for example, Katharine Rodger structures assignments to facilitate students’ understanding of the prevalent genres of writing in the sciences, from the academic introduction, methods, results, and discussion (IMRAD) article to the more popular feature article. Students first familiarize themselves with these via rhetorical analyses of selected texts—participating in both group activities during class, and formal writing assessments on their own. In considering the distinct audiences for these genres, students can discern the variant ways that scientific discourse functions, and how genres respond to and satisfy the rhetorical needs of activity systems—from the academy to the popular press, for instance. Rodger believes the value in these types of analyses lies in having students not only master how to write for a career in science, but to consider why scientists write the way they do.

The dynamic aspects of this curriculum show new teaching approaches and new professional development opportunities for faculty. For example, in response to the university’s desire to implement online learning, in Fall 2013 we began to offer both fully online sections of UWP 1 and a hybrid version (UWP 1Y), in which approximately half of the course curriculum is taught in a computer lab on campus, and half via online modules that are described as “explicit, guided online web-based activities” (UWP website).

Whether online or in person, chief among the stable elements of the UWP is the program’s commitment to teaching, especially undergraduate level courses. Faculty are encouraged and supported in their endeavors to pursue professional development opportunities, both within and beyond the UWP itself—especially those that enrich our pedagogy. In Fall 2012 the Professional Development and Mentoring Committee was established in response to internal program concerns about articulating and maintaining consistencies in our teaching—particularly in curriculum, instruction, and grading practices—especially important as the

UWP continues to expand rapidly. At the first full faculty meeting of the 2012–13 academic year, this new committee set an agenda that included sharing syllabi, facilitating informal class observations among colleagues, and establishing a voluntary mentoring program among new and seasoned faculty.

One of the committee's major projects was to select a number of sample syllabi for our upper-division Advanced Composition course (UWP 101), mentioned above. Providing General Education credit and attracting students from virtually every major on campus, the 80 sections per year of UWP 101 provide "instruction for students in all disciplines in advanced principles of expository writing [and a] [f]ocus on writing tasks both within and beyond the academy" (UCD Catalog). UWP 101 is regarded as difficult to define by some faculty, as its broad objectives result in a wide variety of approaches to the course in terms of structure, assignments, and topical foci. Thus, in soliciting syllabi from faculty, the Professional Development and Mentoring Committee sought to help define the course—while highlighting its possibilities especially in terms of organization and course themes—and to demonstrate how departmental standards may be explicitly integrated into our course materials. The committee looked for class models that exhibited "rigor, clear assignments, and . . . very different" approaches, and by the end of the academic year (2012–13) selected three versions of UWP 101. Faculty who developed them provided syllabi, assignments, and explanations that are now archived on our password-protected faculty secure website. Each instructor explained aspects of their course in a "rationale" that articulates course goals, reading assignment selection, assignment sequence design, course successes and weaknesses, and advice for those thinking about using the course template.

Another change brought about by independence is that professional development opportunities are also encouraged and enabled beyond the UWP and UC Davis via funding made available from various sources. Since 2006, support from the Clark Kerr Fund via the Office of the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Education has enabled UWP faculty to travel, conduct research, and participate in other professional development activities that have directly benefited the quality of our teaching. As our independent program has become more established, we continue to receive that support from the Kerr funds, and also support the increasing number of requests for professional development by drawing on established internal program funding as well.

Particularly significant is the steady increase in number of those taking advantage of such opportunities to attend and present at conferences and professional meetings such as the Conference on College Composition and Communication—for instance, 10 UWP faculty and a number of graduate students affiliated with UC Davis' Designated Emphasis in Writing, Rhetoric, and Composition Studies (described above) attended the 2014 meeting in Indianapolis.

During the course of an academic year, members of our faculty travel throughout the US and internationally to represent the UWP at upwards of two dozen distinct conferences, reflecting not only the wide interests of the program but also the commitment most of us have to professionalization for ourselves.

NEW FACULTY

A further growth in the UWP brought about by independence has come with the addition of new faculty. UWP instructors include full-time lecturers (members of the Academic Federation) and tenure-line faculty (members of the Academic Senate). With independence in 2004 came the university's authorization for the first time of tenure-line positions—five—in Rhetoric and Composition, to augment the more than 35 (at that time) full-time lecturers. Each new tenure-line faculty member brought a unique research agenda to the UWP, and in the 10 years since independence we have published numerous books and articles on WAC, computers and writing, technical communication, second language writing and applied linguistics, rhetoric, and composition (see also Kearns & Turner, this volume, for the importance of hiring practices). From 35 lecturers at the time of independence, we have in 2014 over 60 full-time lecturers and five Senate faculty—a more than 80% increase in total.

In addition to raising the UWP's profile nationally and internationally—a benefit for the faculty, for the UWP, and for UC Davis—this research activity has brought new kinds of expertise that complement existing strengths among the faculty. Adding faculty with new research interests has also enabled us to add courses. While UWP faculty with expertise in specialist areas such as journalism have traditionally offered courses in those areas, we now also offer courses in technical communication and rhetorical theory such as Writing User Experience Documentation (UWP 110), Introduction to Professional Editing (UWP 112A), Rhetoric of Science (UWP 120), and History of Scientific Writing (UWP 121). These courses, in addition to drawing on faculty strengths in these areas, also contribute to our writing minor and developing major.

OTHER EFFECTS MADE POSSIBLE BY INDEPENDENCE: THE PROFESSIONAL WRITING MINOR AND WORK TOWARD THE MAJOR

The history of the UWP Minor in Writing goes back to the mid 1990s, when the program was still within the English department. At that time, a number of writing faculty—many of whom were later instrumental in shaping the new, independent program as it split from English—proposed a writing minor to be

offered through the English department. In spite of a great deal of support for the initial proposal, implementation of the minor stalled in English. Yet interest among faculty—both within and beyond the composition program—and students never waned, and drafts of a “Proposed Expository Writing Minor” were developed during the first two years of our program’s independence. In 2007, a minor proposal, supported by a student petition, was submitted to the university and was approved that year. The Minor in Expository Writing began enrolling students in 2009. It requires 20 units of course work spread over four areas of emphasis: Writing in Academic Settings; Writing in the Professions; Theory, History, and Design; and Writing Internship. Benefits to students of the UWP Professional Writing Minor include:

- Extended writing expertise and knowledge
- Pre-professional training in writing
- Preparation for graduate or professional school
- Certification of writing expertise

In 2012, the UWP modified the name of the minor from Expository Writing to Professional Writing, explaining that the latter is prevalent in writing programs across the country and would therefore increase recognition and prestige of our own minor. Likewise, students would benefit directly from a more accurate and versatile certification of the writing experience gained via the minor. As Thaiss and Goodman note, the UC was founded (1858), in contrast with European and East Coast universities of the time, to have both “classical” and “practical” aspects (2012, p. 456), and in keeping with this, our minor provides students with both “advanced instruction and opportunities for practical experience” (p. 464).

In its first two years, the program graduated 72 minors and enrolled another 133 self-declared minors from a wide range of majors across campus. By 2014, the number of graduates had risen to more than 250.

WAC EXPANSION AND CHANGE SINCE INDEPENDENCE

Another aspect of the UWP that continues to anchor our program in the campus landscape is the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program. Since 2000, the program has consisted of five UWP instructors (up from the three in the early 1990s) who offer pedagogy workshops and one-on-one consultations to help faculty across the curriculum integrate writing into their courses. UC Davis’ new General Education requirements, implemented in 2011, upped the ante by increasing the amount of writing and feedback in courses that meet the Writing Experience requirement. All Davis students must complete 2–3 of these

WE courses, in addition to meeting the lower and upper-division writing course requirements that we have described to this point. Over 1,500 WE courses in 80 majors across campus have been approved by the Academic Senate.

Before 2011, a WE course “require[d] one extended writing assignment (five pages or more) or multiple short assignments.” To count as WE now, a course must include at least 10 pages of graded writing and ways for students to receive and apply feedback on their writing. The latter requirement may be met by giving feedback on a draft of a long paper, by assigning a series of shorter papers with the same evaluation criteria so that what students learn on one paper is applied to the rest, or through a combination of these two approaches.

These stronger requirements gave the WAC team a chance to reach out across campus, tapping into new, or newly revived, faculty attention to questions on topics ranging from fostering student learning to handling the increased paper load. Sixty percent of departments responded positively to an unsolicited contact. In addition, WAC team members met with faculty before and after sessions devoted to training of departmental TAs, using the TA training as a way to enter into conversations about writing pedagogy more broadly.

The main emphasis of WAC/WID at Davis is on improving undergraduate teaching. However, since independence of the UWP, the WAC program has also received funding from Graduate Studies to expand our services (see also MacDonald et al. for a similar program). Graduate students can now attend writing courses and workshops on a range of topics (active reading strategies, using EndNote to organize research, and overcoming writing blocks are some of the most popular); come to on-campus writing “retreats” that feature coffee, snacks, and a supportive writing environment; and get one-on-one help with their writing.

The one-on-one consultations are provided by Graduate Writing Fellows (GWFs), graduate students from a range of disciplines who have some training or experience in writing pedagogy and who offer guidance on everything from the macro (how to manage a large-scale writing project) to the micro (nuances of style and how to use them appropriately in a given genre and disciplinary context). GWFs have come from Applied Linguistics, Education, English, Entomology, and Plant Biology. The program began with two GWFs in 2007 and now has five. This increase reflects Graduate Studies’ “realization that completion rates and time to degree matter” (Thaiss & Goodman, 2012, p. 463).

Thus, UWP faculty serving on the WAC team foster student success at all levels, indirectly with faculty and directly with students, further strengthening the importance of writing pedagogy, and of writing generally, throughout the university. Independence has given us the resources, flexibility, and speed of response to address changing and growing university needs.

LOOKING TO THE FUTURE OF THE UWP

Carl Whithaus, Professor and Director of the University Writing Program

The future of the University Writing Program at UC Davis will continue to rely on the vertical and horizontal structures that have been elaborated since the creation of an independent writing program in 2004. We have already discussed how our curriculum is structured to address student needs ranging from first-year writing through workshops and seminars for graduate students. We have also explored the wide variety of collaborations with other programs and departments that provide robust horizontal connections across units at our institution. As we move forward, a number of faculty-led initiatives promise to insure that our independent writing program will continue to help students develop as writers over the course of multiple years at the university and will continue to work collaboratively with other departments. These initiatives include: (a) the development of our Professional Writing minor and major, (b) an increasing emphasis on connections between research and teaching, and (c) renewed energy behind our two departmental publications (*Writing on the Edge* and *Prized Writing*).

While we have been emphasizing the ways in which our writing program works within the fabric of our institution to make both vertical and horizontal connections, it is important to pause here and note that these initiatives represent a different sort of pairing. Each of these three initiatives emphasizes in its own way how the professional development of faculty in an independent writing program and the needs of students can be interconnected in powerful and mutually supportive ways. The connections between faculty expertise within a department and students' abilities to graduate with current knowledge about their discipline speaks to the core mission of universities.

Within Writing Studies, however, our concerns have often been focused on preparing students for their work in other disciplines rather than within Rhetoric and Composition itself. That is, our programs have often been seen—if not constructed—as primarily vehicles for delivering service courses. The rise of independent writing programs (IWPs) as documented in *A Field of Dreams* began to challenge this model of writing programs as only service programs. The growth and development of IWPs over the last decade has helped to refine the disciplinary boundaries and goals of Writing Studies. Both within our discipline as a field, as well as within the daily functioning of our writing programs, issues of faculty professional development and student need have continued to connect in mutually supportive ways.

(A) DEVELOPING A PROFESSIONAL WRITING MAJOR

At UC Davis, a particularly important connection between student need and faculty expertise within the discipline of Writing Studies has occurred around the development of our Professional Writing Minor and Major. The success of the Minor, noted in the previous section, has shown that students from across disciplinary interests are looking for a concentrated area of study that will support and develop their commitment to writing and rhetoric in a range of disciplinary and professional contexts. The expertise of our enlarged faculty in both research and teaching since independence makes such a major possible. The success of similar majors, as noted below, reinforces our plan.

While the institutional process of proposing and receiving approval for the Writing Minor from the Faculty Senate and support from myriad administrative offices required defining a curriculum, the development was not as intensive as that required to propose a Professional Writing major. For the major, the writing program had to present a clear articulation of what constitutes an undergraduate curriculum in Writing Studies as *a sequence that develops over four years* rather than as a series of related, but not sequenced, courses, as occurred with the proposal for the minor.

Over two academic years, our faculty have reviewed a wide range of literature that sketches out how programs in Writing Studies, Professional Writing, and Technical Communication define and sequence their curricula. Beginning in 2013, the Major/Minor Committee consists of nine faculty charged with supporting the Professional Writing Minor and developing a proposal for a Professional Writing Major. They spent a year reviewing professional writing majors at many of the 142 institutions that Yeats and Thompson identify in their survey of professional writing programs. These institutions included Carnegie Mellon, Purdue, North Carolina State, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Michigan State. (In this volume, see the Royer/Schendel and Kearns/Turner chapters for discussions of professional writing within writing majors, as well as Lalicker for a discussion of major as a basic “equity” for writing programs.)

The proposed major is structured around a core for all Professional Writing students and three emphasis areas: (1) Scientific and Technical Communication, (2) Journalism and Digital Communication, and (3) Writing in Communities and Organizations. The core has two lower division requirements: UWP 1 (First-Year Writing) and a new course, UWP 10 (Introduction to Professional Writing Studies); three lower division electives (UWP 17, Writing and Design; UWP 18, Style in the Essay; and UWP 19, Writing Research Papers); five required upper division courses; three upper division, writing-intensive electives; and five required courses in an emphasis area (See Figure 7.1). The major requires 68

A. B. Major Requirements: Major in Professional Writing

Preparatory Subject Matter 20
 UWP 001: (or equivalent in Comp Lit, NAS). 4
 UWP 010: Introduction to Professional Writing Studies 4
Two courses from: 8
 UWP 011: Popular Science & Technology Writing
 UWP 012: Writing & Visual Rhetoric
 UWP 47: Persuasive Writing
 UWP 48: Style in Academic Writing
 UWP 49: Research Writing
One course from: 4
 UWP 50: Digital Rhetoric
 UWP 51: Rhetoric & Culture.

Depth Courses 44
 UWP 100: Genre Theory & Professional Writing 4
 UWP/ENL/LIN 106: English Grammar 4
 CLA 110: Origins of Rhetoric (?) [not yet approved] 4
 UWP 190: Capstone in Professional Writing. 4
 UWP 192: Writing Internship. 4
Two courses from 8
 UWP 101: Advanced Composition
 UWP 102A–M: Writing in the Disciplines
 UWP 104A–T: Writing in the Professions
 UWP 112A: Introduction to Professional Editing
 ENL 100 NF: Creative Writing Nonfiction
One course from 4
 UWP 110 series (A–Genres in PW; B–Travel Writing; C–Proposals)
Three courses in one of the following emphases: 12

Scientific & Technical Communication
 UWP 113 series (A–Topics in TC; B–Theory & Research in TC; C–User Documentation)
 UWP 120–Rhetoric of Science & Technology
 UWP 121–History of Scientific Writing
 One non-UWP course (see Appendix C: Recommended Electives)

Writing in Communities & Organizations
 UWP 114 series (A–Topics in WC&O; B–Writing in the Public Interest; C–Writing in Global Contexts)
 UWP 130–Writing Research in Communities & Cultures
 One non-UWP course (see Appendix C: Recommended Electives)

TOTAL UNITS FOR MAJOR. 64

Figure 7.1: Requirements for the UWP Professional Writing Major.

units (of 180 required for graduation on the quarter system), which is a sufficiently low number to encourage and facilitate double majoring. While the UWP offers many of the courses needed for the major, we are developing many of the proposed classes that will round out the offerings for the Areas of Emphasis. At this point, the UWP plans to submit its proposal for the Professional Writing Major during the 2016–17 academic year.

Developing the Professional Writing Major is an ongoing process that has contributed to the professional development of writing program faculty, to increasing horizontal connections with the undergraduate programs in Communication and English, and to strengthening relationships with stakeholders ranging from undergraduate students interested in writing to professional organizations such as the *Sacramento Bee* and technical firms in the Silicon Valley.

(B) INCREASING EMPHASIS ON CONNECTIONS BETWEEN TEACHING AND RESEARCH

By combining support from the Clark Kerr Endowment and internal program funds, we have been able to increase the number of conferences that can be attended by lecturers. These conferences include the Association for Business Communication (ABC), the Conference on College Composition and Communication (4Cs), the Popular Culture Association/American Culture Association (PCA/ACA), and the Western States Rhetoric Conference, as well as a wide range of conferences on genre, rhetoric, or pedagogy. Participating in these conferences increases opportunities for faculty professional development. While these moves can be read as positive, because they increase the professional engagement of the faculty, they do present the possibility that we are creating what Chris Tonelli (2013) has called a “shadow track.” For Tonelli, these “shadow tracks” can create labor expectations where non-tenure track faculty participation at conferences and in disciplinary research is valued by writing programs, but not officially recognized by institutions.

While there certainly is the danger of creating a “shadow track,” the other side of having opportunities for all faculty—tenure-track and non-tenure track—to take part in professional conferences and research on teaching highlights disciplinary knowledge as an important aspect of faculty “citizenship” within the writing program (see also Davies, Kearns & Turner, and Rhoades et al., , this volume, for the role of professionalization for writing programs faculty). Jonathan Hunt (2013) has argued that writing programs should foster faculty engagement with disciplinary concerns and curriculum development by arranging governance structures and professional development opportunities for all faculty, not just tenure-track faculty. Hunt’s argument emerges from the

context of the University of San Francisco writing program, which is an independent writing program that houses a writing minor and is in the process of developing a writing major. Like UC Davis and USE, many independent writing programs are now developing programmatic structures that foster the participation of all faculty—regardless of rank or employment “track”—in professional conferences and conversations focused on Writing Studies. Extending faculty engagement with the scholarship on teaching and learning not only benefits the faculty members as individuals but also helps institutions employ the most current pedagogies and curricula.

**(C) RENEWED ENERGY BEHIND OUR TWO UWP PUBLICATIONS:
WRITING ON THE EDGE AND *PRIZED WRITING***

Scholarship on teaching and learning, particularly when focused on writing and writing instruction, has a long history as a research area. As a writing program that was housed within English before it became a stand-alone program more than 10 years ago, the UC Davis University Writing Program has a history of publishing both scholarship and student work. As described earlier, UWP is the home of two journals: *Writing on the Edge* (WOE) and *Prized Writing*—each of which is in its 25th consecutive year. As a scholarly journal, WOE publishes peer-reviewed articles focused on writing and the teaching of writing; however, it also works to push the boundaries of what we define as an essay or scholarly article. Writing in “Teacher to Teacher,” Andrea Lunsford comments on WOE’s place within the constellation of academic journals; she writes,

Just this week I received the latest issue of *WOE: Writing on the Edge*, a journal I think of as leading the way in redefining the essay or at the very least stretching its boundaries. In it, the new editor, David Masiel, reflects on the run of this journal, which was founded in Fall 1989 by John Boe at the University of California, Davis. Masiel harks back to the editors’ column for that first issue, written by Boe and Brian Connery, where they say, “We do not want our authors to be constrained by standard generic molds: review articles, theoretical essays, empirical reports on controlled research, or what-to-do-on-Monday staffroom exchanges. We’re interested in the borders, both real and imagined, within our profession: between freshman composition and creative writing, between technical writing and rhetoric, between tenured staff and part-timers, between humanities and social sciences, between

students and instructors, and between the school and wherever it is that students go after they leave us . . . but we are not always or exactly sure what shapes and strategies these might be, and we rely on you, the authors and readers, to show us the possibilities." (2013, p. 3)

Masiel confesses to being surprised that this message still holds up today, and certainly *WOE* has delivered on its promise since that first issue. Recent issues hold to the vision, no exception. For example, the Fall 2013 issue includes poetry, fiction, an autoethnography, an interview—and what I would call an essay on essays, “Composing: An Arts Logica” by Adam M. Pacton.

As a scholarly journal housed within a now independent writing program, *WOE* not only continues to push the genre and scholarly boundaries, but having faculty involved in editing the journal helps reinvigorate the program’s commitment to experimenting with and developing pedagogical practices that engage undergraduate and graduate students.

As an anthology of UC Davis undergraduate student writing selected through an annual writing contest, the UWP’s other publication, *Prized Writing*, is a vehicle for connecting student learning with publication, a reading series by student authors, and other community events. While essays from *Prized Writing* are often used as exemplary texts in courses throughout the UWP, the benefit from having the journal published by the writing program is also the care and involvement of faculty with selecting the winning essays and working with the authors to refine their essays for publication. That process of getting together to talk about the most valuable, moving pieces of student writing is a process of professional development and community building for the writing program itself.

CONCLUSION

Writing Studies as a discipline now has a rich history of research represented by more than five decades of publications on topics ranging from first-year composition through professional and technical writing. And yet, like math departments, writing programs exist to develop students’ abilities as both a skill set that is fundamental across almost all majors and as an independent disciplinary and professional field. In this context, it is vital to understand how faculty professional development and the needs of students are interconnected, because independent writing programs thrive not only based on developing students’ skills as writers but also by developing the body of knowledge that helps define—and advance—the field of Writing Studies. For the UWP at UC Davis, the processes of proposing a Professional Writing Major, placing an in-

creased emphasis on the connections between faculty's teaching and research activities, and bringing a renewed energy to our two departmental publications strengthen the links between supporting faculty professional development and meeting student needs.

Indeed, as collaboration among the five of us (with advice from other UWP faculty as well), this essay itself exemplifies that synergy between student-centeredness and our collective growth as teachers and scholars. Embodied in the four trajectories with which we began this essay and in the initiatives for the future with which we conclude it, that synergy has been our greatest ongoing strength over our now more than 30 years as an enterprising organization with its own evolving disciplinary identity.

NOTE OF THANKS

We are grateful to John Boe, Margaret Eldred, Peter Hays, Michael Hoffman, Hans Ostrom, and Karl Zender for their help in constructing a history of the writing program from the 1960s to the 1980s and to Susan Palo for both her memories and her help in editing a draft of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

- Bérubé, M. (2013). The humanities, unraveled. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Humanities-Unraveled/137291/>.
- Bieber, J. P. & Worley, L. K. (2006). Conceptualizing the academic life: Graduate students' perspectives. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 77(6), 1009–1035.
- Ferris, D. & Thaiss, C. (2011). Writing at UC Davis: Addressing the needs of second language writers. *Across the Disciplines*, 8. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/atd/ell/ferris-thaiss.cfm>.
- Hunt, J. (2013, July). *Exploring "new norms," "old norms," and "third norms" for employment in a writing department*. Paper presented at Council of Writing Program Administrators, Savannah, GA.
- Leonard, D. (2011). *Why we teach "ESL writing": A socio-historic discussion of an undergraduate ESL program* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Davis, Davis, CA.
- Lunsford, A. (2013). *Teacher to teacher*. Do you read WOE? Retrieved from <http://blogs.bedfordstmartins.com/bits/andrea-lunsford/do-you-read-woe/alunsford/>.
- McLeod, S. (Ed.) (1988). *Strengthening programs in writing across the curriculum*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- McLeod, S. & Miraglia, E. (1997). Whither WAC? Interpreting the stories/histories of mature WAC programs. *Writing Program Administration*, 20(3), 46–65.
- McLeod, S. & Soven, M. (Eds.) (2006). *Composing a community: A history of writing across the curriculum*. Anderson, SC: Parlor Press.

- Miles, L., Pennell, M., Hensley Owens, K. & Dyehouse, J. (2008). Comments on Douglas Downs and Elizabeth Wardle's "Teaching about writing, righting misconceptions." *College Composition and Communication*, 59(3), 503–511.
- O'Neill, P., Crow, A. & Burton, L. (Eds.) (2002). *A field of dreams: Independent writing programs and the future of composition studies*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press.
- Russell, D. R. (2002). *Writing in the academic disciplines: A curricular history* (2nd ed.). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Sheuring, A. F. (2001). *Abundant harvest: The history of the University of California, Davis*. Davis, CA: UC Davis History Project.
- Thaiss, C., Bräuer, G., Carlino, P., Ganobcsik-Williams, L. & Sinha, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Writing programs worldwide: Profiles of academic writing in many places*. Fort Collins, CO: WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/books/wpww>.
- Thaiss, C. & Goodman, G. (2012). Writing at UC Davis: Writing in disciplines and professions from the undergraduate first year through graduate school. In C. Thaiss, G. Bräuer, P. Carlino, L. Ganobcsik-Williams & A. Sinha (Eds.), *Writing programs worldwide: Profiles of academic writing in many places* (pp. 455–467). Fort Collins, CO: WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press. Retrieved from <http://wac.colostate.edu/books/wpww>.
- Tonelli, C. (2013, July). *Playing at tenure: Duplicating the tenure track*. Paper presented at Council of Writing Program Administrators, Savannah, GA.
- University of California, Davis. (2012). *General Catalog 2012–2013, 2013–2014*. Davis, CA: Office of the Registrar.
- Wardle, E. (2007). Understanding "transfer" from FYC: Preliminary results of a longitudinal study." *Writing Program Administration*, 31(1/2), 65–85.
- Yeats, D. & Thompson, I. (2010). Mapping technical and professional communication: A summary and survey of academic locations for programs. *Technical Communication Quarterly*, 19(3), 225–261.