MINUTES OF BUSINESS MEETING

1. Meeting convened (Chair: Stuart Brown) — 3:57

2. Update of Consortium web site (Jim Porter)
   - Jim’s proposal: upgrade web site in summer 2006 —> Why? To increase value, functionality, and interactivity of site to members. Two questions: (a) how to pay for the upgrade – approximately $1,000-$1,500; (b) what kind of information and functionality would be useful to have? (e.g., institutions can update own information; use the site as a mechanism for conducting survey)
   - purpose of site: for use by own members vs. for promotional purposes. Use the site itself as a means for advertising the field (Gail Hawisher)
   - provide more information about mission and “heart” of programs (J. Lauer); “thumbnail sketch” would be useful (John Ackerman)
   - set up sortable database (e.g., geographical); setting up visualization (field mapping, mapping professions)? (Cindy Selfe)
   - OSU and Purdue have offered to help out (Cindy Selfe, Pat Sullivan) —> use database for mapping field
   - possible funding venues: Pew or Carnegie? WIDE Research Center at MSU

3. Issues of Membership Dues (Stuart Brown) — 4:10
   - report on status of Consortium account: account balance approximately $527
   - account is missing $130 (to El Paso Fitness Center) —> Stuart has filed police report
   - Janice and Stuart will work on fixing the account to allow for adding/accessing funds
   - Consortium agreed last year to set up $50 membership fee; there will be follow up shortly about that

4. Consortium caucus/meeting for 2006 CCCC (Gail Hawisher)
   Q: What should our focus be for next year’s CCCC?
   - Is there core or canonical knowledge to the discipline? (Carolyn Miller)
   - Do mapping of the profession, have people bring different visualizations (Cindy Selfe)
   - Report on the outcome of the NRC proposal (Janice Lauer)
   - Older programs’ identities vs. newer programs’ identities (Wendy Scheer); how have programs changed over time (Gail Hawisher)
   - Use the Consortium meeting as a vehicle for supporting future CCCC panel proposal (like the IP Caucus)(Karen Lunsford); take the consortium program on the road (Gail Hawisher)
   - What was the impetus for new programs? (Kevin DePew)
   - 1:45 time limit for session (within Caucus format)
   - Gail: Email me if you want to contribute to a workshop on mapping the field. (Gail, as new Chair, will be submitting Consortium caucus proposal.)

5. Update on NRC Assessment (Louise Phelps) — 4:30
Information is difficult to find out, but as far as Louise can tell, if there is an update of the taxonomy, then Rhetoric/Composition will be listed as a new field.
- Louise provides handout of draft of NRC survey for programs (institutional questionnaire) + PPT slides from NRC.
- Louise talks about timetable for NRC taxonomy process: "We have to put on a full court press for faculty and administrators to contact their institutional coordinator and let them know about the need to provide this data to NRC." Could happen in early May.
- Late September 2006: faculty questionnaire will be distributed.
- October 2006: student questionnaire will be distributed (English one of areas being studied, so some R/C students in English will be asked to submit/complete survey). Possible problem: Will students list R/C as subfield of English (which contradicts the proposal we have submitted which treats R/C as its own field)?
- Louise: "What we should be doing right now is informing everybody" to be alert to the importance of the questionnaires (and the importance of listing R/C as an "emerging field") and to contact their institutional coordinators — and there will not be a lot of advance notice about this.
- Disaggregating R/C data from other English data is important to do, but it may be difficult to do (Janice Lauer)

6. Report on Survey Data Collection (John Ackerman)
- 80% response rate on program surveys (65 out of 78)
- data collected belongs to field
- Louise Phelps: "If anybody knows about new programs, please let us know."

7. Question of Faculty Identity in R/C — How to Define? (Kathleen Welch)
Q: How should somebody be designated as a rhetoric/composition faculty member? Are there criteria for this? (case: questionable claim by faculty member at Oklahoma) Could the Consortium or its members provide feedback and help?
- Pat Sullivan: The ads for new positions in rhetoric/composition would provide some criteria for determining national standards in the field as to what constitutes specialization in rhetoric/composition.
- Carolyn Miller: Sustained publication record and scholarly activity should count more than course work or graduate training.
- Louise Phelps: Look at NRC criteria for defining a faculty member in a specialization area.

8. Nominations for New Assistant Chair (Stuart Brown)
- Hugh Burns volunteers —> No action taken on nomination.

9. Meeting adjourned — 5:12

Respectfully submitted,
Jim Porter

F Y I, number in attendance at Consortium
@ 3:00 pm — 28 (MA panel)
@ 4:00 pm — 19
@ 4:30 pm — 21

- 03.22.06
A reminder about our annual meeting at the CCCC. Not sure yet of the location, but we shouldn't be hard to find.

Any questions, please get in touch. I best can be reached from Sat. Mar. 18 until the meeting time at my cell--505-644-9553—or I will be at the Palmer House sometime Tues afternoon.

Stuart

**Consortium of Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition Caucus**

**Session:** DP.1 on Mar 22, 2006 from 1:30 PM to 5:00 PM  **Cluster:** n/a  **Not Applicable**  
**Type:** Caucus  **Interest Emphasis:** not applicable  
**Level Emphasis:** cross-institutional

This two-part caucus session will include discussions of issues affecting doctoral and masters programs and Consortium organizing.

Session Description: The Consortium of Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition, comprising representatives of some seventy institutions, has met for more than 15 years at CCCC, most recently in 3-4 hour blocks on Wednesday as a Caucus. CCCC is the natural home for the groups annual meeting since our interests in graduate education are intricately bound with the organization's.

The first part of this year's program will be a workshop themed around the connections between MA and PhD programs. The "conversation" will be led by representatives from both who will provide brief opening statements or "talking points." See attached titles. Our intention is to provide a forum to generate a dialogue among people teaching at both MA and PhD programs in order to better understand the issues affecting programs, but also to foster more productive relationships.

The second part of the Caucus will be the business meeting of the Consortium and focus on organizational aspects.

**Participants**
Stuart C. Brown Chair sbrown@nmsu.edu 505-646-2413 
Kate Mangelsdorf Speaker 1 kmangels@utep.edu 505-747-6623 
Helen Foster Speaker 1 hfoster@utep.edu 915-747-6623

2/27/2006
Peter Vandenberg Speaker 2 pvandenb@depaul.edu 773-325-1795 edit |
remove
Seth Kahn Speaker 3 skahn@wcupa.edu 610-436-2915 edit | remove
Heidi Estrem Speaker Additional hestrem@emich.edu 734-487-0148 edit |
remove
Barbara Gleason Speaker Additional glsnbarb@aol.com 212-650-6329 edit |
remove
Robert Johnson Speaker Additional rrjohnso@mtu.edu
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