CONSORTIUM OF DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN RHETORIC AND COMPOSITION

CCCC MILWAUKEE 1996

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 4:30–6:00

MECCA Auditorium/ Kilbourn Room South, 1st Floor

AGENDA:

1. Background of the Consortium –

2. Membership List, Dues, and Stationery: Janice Lauer

3. Continuing Business: Reports and discussion of the work of subcommittees
   a. Home page (Agora: http://www.uknor.edu/agora/): Catherine Hobbs
   b. Dissertation categories in the DAI: Chuck Bazerman, Linda Ferreira-Buckley, Rhonda Grego
   c. Web site: Consortium programs and courses: Lisa McClure
   d. Graduate student exchange of information: Lisa McClure
   e. Regional networking, etc.: Paul Ranieri
   f. Support for developing programs: Charles Bazerman, Ann Merle Feldman
   g. Graduate program survey: Stuart Brown

3. New business
   a. Program criteria or ranking: John Warnock
   b. Program review: Louise Phelps
   c. Other

DUES AND LISTS OF DISSERTATIONS

1. Please send new dissertation listings to Catherine Hobbs at the University of Oklahoma.

2. Membership dues are by institution. Please send your dues ($10 for 2 years) to Janice Lauer at Purdue. Make dues payable to "Doctoral Consortium in Rhetoric and Composition." For those institutions needing a Tax ID number, it is 35-192-1404TT.
February 22, 1996

Dear Representative:

Attached find a copy of the agenda for our Consortium meeting at the CCCC. In early December I posted advanced notice of the time of our meeting, Wednesday, March 27, 4:30-6:00.

Also included is a copy of the latest version of the Consortium list. Let me clarify that membership is by institution, not individual. If more than one person wants to be listed, the first one will receive the mailings, which can be passed on. Of course, all e-mail addresses will be part of the Listserv. Please notify me of any errors or changes.

Please send your dues to defray the cost of mailings and other consortium endeavors. A separate slip is enclosed for your convenience.

I look forward to seeing you at our meeting at the CCCC.

Best,

Janice Lauer
Coordinator
CONSORTIUM OF DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN RHETORIC AND COMPOSITION

Leigh Magnuson, Director
University Microfilms International
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

April 25, 1996

Dear Ms. Magnuson:

I am writing on behalf of the Consortium of Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition, an organization representing fifty-nine institutions granting the Ph.D. specialization. We urge you to add “Rhetoric and Composition” as a disciplinary category coequal with the existing categories “Communication and the Arts,” “Education,” and “Language, Literature, and Linguistics.”

It has long been our sense that the humanities subject categories do not describe the dissertations in our field. To examine the issue more objectively, we studied seventy-five dissertations we have supervised. We then sought to determine the broadest possible term that would account for those dissertations and settled upon “Rhetoric and Composition.”

As you know, rhetoric and composition is a fast-growing field, and we are particularly eager to help researchers locate the contributions of our graduate students. In the future, we would be pleased to suggest subcategories (e.g., history of, theories of, ethnography, technology) that describe dissertations in rhetoric and composition.

If I can answer questions, please do not hesitate to call me. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Janice M. Lauer
Coordinator, Consortium of Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition
Reece McGee Distinguished Professor of English

Department of English
Purdue University
W. Lafayette, IN 47907

317-743-3021
317-494-4425
jlauer@omni.cc.purdue.edu
University of Alabama
University of Arizona
Ball State University
Bowling Green State University
University of California, S. Barbara
University of California, S. Diego
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University of Cincinnati
University of Connecticut
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Illinois State University
University of Illinois, Champaign
University of Illinois, Chicago
Indiana University
Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Iowa State University
Louisiana State University
University of Louisville
University of Maryland
University of Massachusetts
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Michigan Tech University
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of Mississippi
University of Nebraska
University of Nevada
University of New Hampshire
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University of New Mexico
City University of New York
SUNY, Albany
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University of North Carolina
Northern Illinois University
Northwestern State University
Ohio State University
University of Oklahoma
Penn State University
University of Pittsburgh
Purdue University
Rensselaer Polytechnic
University of Rhode Island
University of South Carolina
University of South Florida
Southern Illinois University
University of Southern Mississippi
University of Southwestern Louisiana
Syracuse University
University of Tennessee
Texas Christian University
University of Texas, Arlington
University of Texas, Austin
University of Utah
University of Washington
Washington State University
Wayne State University
Janice:

You may get this before you leave for Milwaukee, but even if you do not, return.

Late last week Janet Atwill sent me some materials from last year. About ten institutions answered some questions about networking and I had a chance to look at them over the weekend. Here are some observations:

--it seems to me that with the power of email, many of the benefits of regional working groups are no longer valid. Almost all of the groups responding ssid regional networking is a good idea, but then they almost all raised problems with defining the group, with the geographic spread for some regions, and for the flood of information they already feel overburdened with.

--the consortium already has the discussion list and the home page which facilitate communication when institutions need it.

--could we maybe shift our focus to maybe a section on the homepage for those who want to consider student/faculty exchanges--though again that would not have to be regionally restricted? I might even be able to coordinate that information, providing some direction is given by the consortium. We could link on the homepage to me and I could do any mass announcements on the listserv.

--we could encourage some regional get togethers as we do around than anything else, given the variety of distances between programs around the country.

I hope that provides a bit more context for my thinking at this point. Much of the impetus behind networking is good, but other events may now limit its full scale implementation and we may be able to do a few other things (e.g., exchanges) by using the resources we already have and not over-burdening those of us who have too much to do as it is (and the survey sheets I had sent to me seem to confirm that).

Finally, two other points:

--I had processed our dues and they should be to you as soon as the wheels of this institution can fully turn!

--we at Ball State decided two years ago to limit our program to 3-4 doctoral admits a year and a similar number of masters students. I just wanted to let you know that if that issue comes up.

I hope the conference goes well. I regret not being there, but the work of the assistant chairperson does not end. In addition, we just released our draft report of our 5 year study of the General Studies program, and since I chair the committee, I need to be available for the public forum--some real practical rhetoric as James Kinneavy used to say. Thanks for carrying these messages to the conference, and if I missed you, they can provide some context for our discussion on you return.

Paul Ranieri
Ball State University
Message 3/26  From John Warnock                      Apr 3, 96 02:19:30 pm -0700
Date: Wed, 03 Apr 1996 14:19:30 -0700 (MST)
Subject: Relation to "English"?
To: consortium-l@mtu.edu
X-Envelope-to: consortium-l@mtu.edu
X-VMS-To: IN"consortium-l@mtu.edu"
X-VMS-Cc: JWARNOCK
Precedence: list
Reply-To: consortium-l@mtu.edu

Hello all,
At Arizona, our students receive their PhD degrees in "Rhetoric,
Composition, and the Teaching of English," not in "English." Our MA's
receive their degrees in "English, with a Concentration in..." RCTE.
As part of a University-wide...thing, our Provost has asked the
English department to explain why its four graduate degrees (English, RCTE,
MFA, MA in English Language and Linguistics) should not be collapsed into
one.
Which leads me to ask you all, or any of you with the time and
inclination to respond:
Are your PhD degrees given in "English," or what?
Do you have any stories to tell about the advantages or otherwise
of your particular arrangements?
Do you have any thoughts about what arrangement is best for our
students and ourselves?
We are supposed to respond to this by, like, tomorrow, which
doesn't mean we can't go on having a discussion if we want.

John

John Warnock
Rhetoric, Composition and the Teaching of English
Department of English
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ 85721
Fax  520 621-7397
Voice 520 621-1836
On Wed, 3 Apr 1996, John Warnock wrote:

> Which leads me to ask you all, or any of you with the time and
> inclination to respond:
>
> Are your PhD degrees given in "English," or what?

U of New Mexico's degrees are MA in English and PhD in English. The MA has two concentrations: one in literature (i.e., students take 4 exams, at least 3 of which are in lit and 1 one which may be either lit theory or rhetoric/language) and one in writing (i.e., no exams but a mandatory thesis in either creative writing or professional/technical writing). The PhD requires at least three 'concentrations' (i.e., comprehensive examinations) of which 1 must be in a traditional literary field. The other 2 come from a choice including rhetoric/language theory, lit theory, genre (e.g., novel, drama), or a 'special' lit field (e.g., Native American Lit).

> Do you have any stories to tell about the advantages or otherwise
> of your particular arrangements?

Taking 1 MA exam in rhetoric/language is useless. Students don't gain enough information to be comfortable with what they study to teach writing effectively. The PhD doesn't distinguish a major but *does* allow students the flexibility they have to have to make it in today's tight job market.

> We are supposed to respond to this by, like, tomorrow, which
> doesn't mean we can't go on having a discussion if we want.

Good grief, John, isn't this always the way? Hurry up. Make a decision. Tamper with it for years to reconcile issues that should have been solved early on. You have my best wishes!

Lynn Beene
B & F Writers
email: lbeene@unm.edu
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87123

Is it not, then, better to be ridiculous and friendly than clever and hostile?
--Socrates
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In response to John Warnock's post:

I just finished arguing this case for our doctoral proposal, which will be a PhD in Composition and Cultural Rhetoric. A section of the proposal deals with the title of the degree and compares it with others, explaining how the degrees in rhet and comp at various places reflect the disciplinary/interdisciplinary configurations they represent. John, if you want, I could fax you that part of the proposal tomorrow.

Part of your argument might depend on contrasting the choices of title made by other programs (e.g., CMU, which has a separate PhD in each area within its English dept).

My sense is that the trend is toward naming degrees more specifically to reflect the particular interdisciplinary configuration and emphasis that each school's degree represents, in part for competitive reasons, in terms of attracting students and recruiting them. (Example: SUNY Albany's new degree, which is a degree offered by the full (English) dept, but is entitled, if I remember rightly, Writing, Criticism, and Teaching. Someone from Albany can verify or correct this.) It is partly an issue of honesty and clarity in advertising the degree as well as reaching the right audience. People are looking, for example, in guides to grad programs and on the internet by searching for "comp" or "rhet" or whatever (discourse studies, cultural studies, literacy, etc.) Then they are attracted to a particular program because it seems to represent the mix they want. You might want to consider how degrees in other fields are named; a guess might be that they too are becoming more differentiated since degrees are becoming more and more specialized. In other words, the title communicates something about the program, and that matters for its reputation. Think, for example of the original USC program in "rhetoric, linguistics, and literature."

My own position is that composition and rhetoric is not necessarily/historically a part of English studies, but is a discipline on its own which is sometimes configured, as graduate study, within English [but even there, it matters with what other fields or perspectives it is joined: cultural studies, linguistics, literacy, literary or critical theory, literature, etc.]; while other times it might be part of a program in literacy studies, or communication, or education, or rhetoric. It can be either a social science or a humanities field or both. But this is not a popular or simple position or one you can usually argue effectively with deans or provosts. The marketing argument is really the decisive one.

I don't understand what particular value, marketing or otherwise, there would be in rationalizing the degree titles so they are all the same. Wouldn't in fact this be very confusing, e.g., what is an MFA degree in English? since MFAs can be in creative writing, film, video, computer art, etc. but they are not typically in English. I suppose that aside from marketing as a positive feature, one could ask whether eliminating specific titles for degrees would even be a negative factor, since it would not correspond (at least for the MFA) to the language normatively used to name those degrees, which makes them recognizable. Perhaps the provost doesn't understand that it may be the individual programs that have their separate
reputations, not simply that of the dept as a whole.

Louise Phelps

Louise Wetherbee Phelps
Professor of Writing and English
Writing Program, 239 HBC, Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY 13244-1160
lwphelps@syr.edu 315-443-1620 or 1091
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Hi John,

Ours is a Ph.D. in English. People can specialize in rhet/comp just as they can in Renaissance, Victorian, or whatever.

I've always liked it this way on the theory that it gives them an edge in the market. English departments like to hire English Ph.D.s, and despite the growing respect for rhet/comp, I think there is probably some residual resistance to any degree other than in English. At least, that's my theory.

Best regards to yourself and Ms. T.
--Jim Raymond
University of Alabama
JR Raymond@English.as.ua.edu
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Cindy—Our department has a standard teaching load of 2 courses per semester for research active faculty and a load of 3/2 for inactive faculty. All nontenured faculty are automatically put on a 2/2 load since we assume that they will be trying to do what they need to do to get tenure. After that it is very much the head's call and we try not to be too rigid about it. I wouldn't like to see a yearly quota. What I mean is that we don't measure every year—although we are required to hand in yearly reports that indicate everything we did during the year. I think anyone who has any kind of ongoing research profile (articles, chapters, editing books, books, attempting to hit major national publications and journals, etc) keeps the two course teaching load. If anyone seems to be not doing anything at all the teaching load (I hate the term) gets increased. And a few people have brought it down again after renewed activity. We can chat more about this at the consortium meet in Milw. Or I can send you more info if you want. Marie Secor

Marie Secor
The Pennsylvania State University
Department of English
231S Burrowes Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 865-9155 Office Telephone
(814) 863-7285 FAX
Email: mjs8@psu.edu
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John (and everyone else who is following this thread): The Ph.D at Michigan Tech is not in English with a concentration; it is a Rhetoric and Technical Communication degree and our students seem to be successful at getting jobs in both rhetoric and composition and technical communication. If anything the institutional arrangement has made it possible not to be mired in some of the power relations that colleagues in English departments have found themselves. As a Humanities Department we offer an interdisciplinary doctorate which draws upon the resources of faculty with expertise in classical and contemporary rhetoric, linguistics, communication studies, modern languages, philosophy, and composition studies. There is no literature requirement for Ph.D. students, although they may take elective courses in modern languages and literature. This kind of institutional arrangement seems to make it possible for students to take an interdisciplinary approach to the study of written communication in both print and electronic environments. I think the greatest strength of this kind of Ph.D. structure is that students are exposed to a number of different disciplinary methodologies and conceptual frameworks that they can then use to conduct multi-modal research and scholarship. The danger, of course is dillettantism, which means that

Command ('i' to return to index):
The danger is, of course, dilettantism, which means that the major advisor must work closely with the student.

Cheers,

Carol
Hi,
Because we're a department of Rhetoric, our degrees are all offered under that rubric. Our Ph.D. is in Rhetoric and Technical Communication. Our program is too new to know if there are difficulties placing our students in traditional English departments, but our colleagues seem not to have a problem with this.
Billie

Billie Wahlstrom
Professor and Head
Rhetoric Department
University of Minnesota
St. Paul, MN 55108
612.624.7750
bwahlstr@mailbox.mail.umn.edu
http://rhetoric.agoff.umn.edu
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The program at the University of Illinois (Urbana) sounds structurally similar to Utah's. Since 1990 we've had two tracks—one in literature and the other in Writing Studies—both leading to a PhD in English. At the PhD level, students currently have to take three courses in literature, but these can be from any area and most often include coursework related to critical theory or cultural studies. Students have no prelims in literature. In addition to the English Department, there are specializations in Writing Studies in the Department of Speech Communication, the Division of English as an International Language, and the College of Education. Our first two students got jobs in English Departments this year—the University of Northern Arizona and Northern Illinois. We're thrilled!

Gail

> At the University of Utah, we have four tracks leading to the Ph.D. in
> English: Rhet/Comp, British/American lit, American Studies, and Creative
> Writing. All four tracks require at least some literary study. This seems
> to position R/C students pretty well for jobs in English departments.
> For those R/C students who don't have an interest in literary study, we
> have some unique alternatives: a Ph.D. (Rhet/Comp specialization) in the
> Department of Communications and a similar degree in the Department of
> Educational Studies.
> Although it's too soon to tell (we're only in our third year), we think
> that graduates from these latter two programs will have good job prospects
> as well.
>
> Tom Huckin

Gail E. Hawisher
Department of English
Center for Writing Studies
Urbana, IL 61801 (hawisher@uiuc.edu)
217-333-2989; fax 217-333-4321
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John
One reason for specifying which of the growing number of sub-areas of English one gets a degree in is that the job market demands it. One does not get a job in English but in 19th century English lit or classical rhetoric, etc. It would do rhetoric students a disservice if they had to go on the market with PhDs or whatever in English when there is a sellers' market for people with their degrees and a ferocious buyers' market for people with more traditional degrees, particularly lit specialization, in English. I suspect that your students would complain vigorously if you tried to make the change. I know ours would.

Richard
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John: At Indiana University all our PhD's are in English. A student may concentrate in Literacy, Language and Literature as a student would concentrate in Victorian Studies or anything else. Ours is not a Rhetoric and Comp concentration per se. This reflects the coursework taken and the exam set-up such that Literacy with a composition spin might be a student's critical problem-into-dissertation emphasis. At this time, however, just as many of not more of our Literacy students have an emphasis tied to literature/cultural studies.

--Christine farris  
Director of Composition  
Indiana University-Bloomington
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John, our PhD is titled "Rhetoric and Professional Communication" and our MA is in English with four possible emphases.

Given your short time frame, you might consult the Rhetoric Review doctoral survey as we list the various degree titles given us by the programs just after the address.

Stuart C. Brown  
Dept. of English  
New Mexico State University
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At the University of Utah, we have four tracks leading to the Ph.D. in English: Rhet/Comp, British/American lit, American Studies, and Creative Writing. All four track require at least some literary study. This seems to position R/C students pretty well for jobs in English departments.

For those R/C students who don't have an interest in literary study, we have some unique alternatives: a Ph.D. (Rhet/Comp specialization) in the Department of Communications and a similar degree in the Department of Educational Studies.

Although it's too soon to tell (we're only in our third year), we think that graduates from these latter two programs will have good job prospects as well.

Tom Huckin
At Umass-Amherst, all PhD grad.s receive their degree in English whether their specialization is in Renaissance, American Literature, or Composition and Rhetoric. Since we are within the English department, just seems to make sense. I do not believe that it presents an obstacle to our grad.s when they seek jobs. Anne
Date: Fri, 05 Apr 1996 07:32:43 -0700 (MST)
Subject: your response
To: vwn@omni.cc.purdue.edu
X-Envelope-to: vwn@omni.cc.purdue.edu
X-VMS-To: IN%"vwn@omni.cc.purdue.edu"
X-VMS-Cc: JWARNOCK

Janice,

Thanks for your response. Interesting to think that NOT being separated offers an opportunity for the other folks in English to reimagine themselves as part of English Studies, rather than as part of, if the truth were told, Literature departments. I wonder how often that has happened. Yours is the only one I know about, maybe Pittsburgh is another kind of example, CMU?--a credit to you, of course.

Thanks.

John
John—Out students at Penn State receive their degree in English. Period. We went that route when we began because it seemed like an insurmountable hurdle to try to put in a new PhD program and because we didn't want to compete directly with the speech department. The degree has changed somewhat over the years. When we began—with the very grudging support (hardly the word) of the department—students who wanted to do rhetoric and comp pretty much had to do everything a standard English PhD did and then some. That seemed tough, but it actually meant that we got very strong students at the very beginning of the program and that they did very well when they went on the job market.

That success overcame a lot of opposition and doubt in the department—they understood it when we were able to place our students better than anyone else in the department—to the point that when we overhauled our grad program and our exam structure, we were able to make the requirements much more concentrated and much more reasonable. In addition, we have added more faculty who do more kinds of research, and we have always made use of connections with speech, philosophy, education, and psychology departments. That means our students can get a solid background and can pull in people from other fields for their committees. And vice versa, of course—most of us serve on committees in other departments as well.

Nowadays when English is in such flux and turmoil, our rhetoric students do not look at all odd—it seems to me they're as much "English" as anyone else in the field. What this looseness has enabled us to do is attract a wide variety of students. Many of our students do not start out in rhetoric but move over once they find out what it's all about; many students who are not doing rhetoric as a concentration take our seminars because they find them interesting and useful (they can even use them to meet theory requirements).

That's where we are at the moment. We do recruit students for the rhetoric concentration every year. The graduate committee defers to us (because they don't feel that they can effectively judge the applications), so we have what amounts to a special arrangement that enables us to pick and recruit our own students, which no other area group does. And, of course, we pick up some from the MA.

I'll be interested in hearing what others do. Marie

Marie Secor
The Pennsylvania State University
Department of English
231S Burrowes Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 865-9155 Office Telephone
(814) 863-7285 FAX
Email: mjs8@psu.edu
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As part of a drive to eliminate suplicate graduate programs in state uni
As a result, it has been recommended that the Ph.D. in English at the University

Because the fa;pB~ulty has only a little over a week to provide a resa
of our Ph.D. To present the strongest possible defense, we would
appreciate your taking a few minutes to make brief comments to Ann Dobie
dobie@usl.edu) or Jim McDonald (jcm5337@usl.edu) about the quality and
reputation of the rhetoric option of our program. To jog your memory,
or gi3ve you new information, we are including a brief overview of
what we offer.

Over 130 students are now pursuing graduate degrees in English
at USL. Begun in 1968, the Ph.D. offers a generalist program of
studies with options in rhetoric, literature, and creative writing.
The rhetoric option, which is ten years old, has graduated four students,
al of whom are now teaching in tenure track positions in higher
education, three of them at four-year institutions. Of the 25 students
currently enrolled in rhetoric, several are in the process of completing disokse
courses in classical rhetoric, modern composition theory, gender studies,
literacy studies, technical writing, philosophical rhetoric, and others.
A linguistics minor"Ym is required, and a folklore specialty is available.
For over ten years the department has held an annual Rhetoric Symposium, fea
featuring presentations by leading theorists, historians, and educators.
Students and faculty are active in presenting papers and serving in
professional organizations on the local, state, and national levels. They have
have published textbooks, books, and articles on composition theory, rhetorical
linguistics, dialects, syntax, writers' rituals, the Wyoming Resolution,
and other subjects.

For these and other reasons we hope to save our Ph.D. As there
is much more to tell, we will be happy to augment this brief overview
on request. We will particularly appreciate comments you can make
about any or all of the following areas:

1. The quality of graduate students
2. The rigor and appropriateness of the curriculum
3. The quality of the faculty
4. Any other reflections.
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Cindy,
Did you come up with a final document on this? Could I have a copy? Billie

In message <199603221624.LAA160736@r05n01.cac.psu.edu> writes:
> >Consortium Members--
> >
> >Cindy Selfe, here, with a request to you all.
> >
> >Our department is currently trying to come to an understanding of what it
> >means to be a "research-active" faculty member with the attendant reduced
> >teaching load that such a role suggests. The purpose of this exercise--as
> >you might guess--is to work with the Dean and the Provost to assure that
> >faculty who *are* active scholars and researchers get a reduced teaching
> >load appropriate to their profile.
> >
> >So--could you folks describe for me what a typical profile for a
> >research-active scholar at your institution might look like? We're
> >wondering about such things as numbers of publications, kinds of
> >publications (books? articles? edited collections? refereed vs.
> >non-refereed? invited?), quality of publications, rate of publications
> >(over one year period? a three year period?), editorships, professional
> >leadership activities, etc.
> >
> >It would also help if you could characterize the teaching load that
> >generally accompanies such a profile.
> >
> >Finally, do any of y'all have any written departmental guidelines that you
> >provide department members about such a topic?
> >
> >In advance, I thank you for any help that you can provide me in this busy
> >time right before the CCCC's--hope to see many of you in Milwaukee at the
> >Consortium meeting!
> >
> >Cindy
> >
> >Cynthia L. Selfe
> >Humanities Department
> >Michigan Technological University
> >1400 Townsend Dr.
> >Houghton, MI 49931
> >
> >Internet: cyselfe@mtu.edu
> >Telephone: (906) 487-2447
> >Fax: 906/487-3559
> >
> >Cindy--Our department has a standard teaching load of 2 courses per
> >semester for research active faculty and a load of 3/2 for inactive
> >faculty. All nontenured faculty are automatically put on a 2/2 load since
> >we assume that they will be trying to do what they need to do to get
tenure. After that it is very much the head's call and we try not to be
too rigid about it. I wouldn't like to see a yearly quota. What I mean is
that we don't measure every year--although we are required to hand in
yearly reports that indicate everything we did during the year. I think
anyone who has any kind of ongoing research profile (articles, chapters,
editing books, books, attempting to hit major national publications and
journals, etc) keeps the two course teaching load. If anyone seems to be
not doing anything at all the teaching load (I hate the term) gets
increased. And a few people have brought it down again after renewed
activity. We can chat more about this at the consortium meet in Milw. Or I
can send you more info if you want. Marie Secor

Marie Secor
The Pennsylvania State University
Department of English
231S Burrowes Building
University Park, PA 16802
(814) 865-9155 Office Telephone
(814) 863-7285 FAX
Email: mjs8@psu.edu

Billie Wahlstrom
Professor and Head
Rhetoric Department
University of Minnesota
St. Paul, MN 55108
612.624.7750
bwahlstr@mailbox.mail.umn.edu
http://rhetoric.agoff.umn.edu
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HELP WANTED--YOUR THOUGHTS ON THE
DISSERTATION PROCESS IN RHETORIC AND
COMPOSITION

To fellow dissertation candidates and dissertation
committee members in rhetoric and composition:

I'm drafting an essay that details some of the concerns
held by those completing the Ph.D. in rhetoric and
composition. I hope to talk about this endlessly
(re)negotiated activity at the micro and macro level and
from the perspective of candidate and credentialers. For
instance, in my own program, I was surprised that there
were no formal procedures in place to train me to direct
dissertations—I was expected to "know" how the system
worked. Not surprisingly, graduate students have come to
me, feeling the same way—that no one adequately
prepared them for their "job" as candidate, particularly at
the dissertation drafting stage. They also mentioned many
practical problems—for instance, wondering how to
approach a committee member who seems to obstruct
their project or worse, is indifferent, never returning drafts.
And, while many candidates I work with were/are
exceedingly self-motivated, life exigencies can cause
writers to fall behind and put pressure on me as director to
write recommendations before I'm quite comfortable doing
so or to read drafts during times I had hoped to have "free"
for my own work, causing some quiet irritations.

In the past year, I've started to keep my own list of: "this is
what I will do, this is what I won't" and "this is what I hope
you'll do, this is what I hope you don't." And, I've started
to collect stories from others to confirm and disconfirm my
experiences, to broaden my perspective.

So. I'd like to ask anyone reading this message:

a) to pass it on to anyone you think would be interested in
responding

b) to respond yourself if you're willing to share stories,
anecdotes, wish-lists, suggests, ideas, and urgent needs
that would help us with this process.
   Tell me what has gone wrong and what has gone right
   (and why);
   Tell me what would enhance the process for you and
to what degree you think you're discussing a local
problem/success (endemic to your program) or a global
one (part of the professionalization process).
   In your opinion, what would help us all?
Unless you specifically ask me not to, I'll assume I may use these responses as vignettes and voices (tentative, preliminary, and identified anonymously, sometimes quoted, mostly summarized). For instance, I'll write something like "a graduate student in a mid-size program in the east" or "a recent graduate now in the first year of tenure-line teaching" or [feel free to help me create the right tag].

I'll also be glad to copy you a draft of the essay when it is completed if you ask me for it.

At a 4Cs workshop in Milwaukee, I was in a workgroup that talked about the need for a set of guidelines or "bill of rights and responsibilities" for both candidates and directors--this essay will be a "thinking toward" such a list. If you can help me in that thinking, please send me an e-mail or snail mail response and forward this request to friends. Thank you.

Wendy Bishop, Department of English, Florida State University, Tallahassee FL 32306-1036
904-893-1381       wbishop@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

Command ('i' to return to index):
CONSORTIUM OF DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN RHETORIC AND COMPOSITION

DUES $10.00 (for 2 years)

Name of Institution ___________________________ Date _______________________

Representative ________________________________

Address ______________________________________

______________________________________________

Office Phone ____________________________ Tax ID Number (if needed): 35-192-1404TT

e-mail _______________________________________

Please send checks to:

Janice Lauer
Department of English
Purdue University
W. Lafayette, IN 47906

CONSORTIUM OF DOCTORAL PROGRAMS IN RHETORIC AND COMPOSITION

DUES $10.00 (for 2 years)

Name of Institution ___________________________ Date _______________________

Representative ________________________________

Address ______________________________________

______________________________________________

Office Phone ____________________________ Tax ID Number (if needed): 35-192-1404TT

e-mail _______________________________________

Please send checks to:

Janice Lauer
Department of English
Purdue University
W. Lafayette, IN 47906
December 30, 1996

Dear Representative:

Below is information to guide your plans for the CCCC.

CONSORTIUM MEETING AT THE CCCC

Our annual meeting is scheduled for: WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 6:30--7:45.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR THE CCCC ANNUAL MEETING

1. On-going Efforts

   a. Home page (Agora: http://www.uoknor.edu/agora/): Catherine Hobbs
      and Jana Moring

   b. Dissertation categories in the DAI: Janice Lauer

   c. Web site: Consortium programs and courses: Lisa McClure

   d. Graduate student exchange: Lisa McClure

   e. Regional networking, etc.: Members

   f. Support for developing programs: Louise Phelps

   g. Graduate program survey of student placement: Jeanne Fahrenstock,
      Marie Secor, Robert Schwegler

   h. Program Review, Criteria: Louise Phelps, Cindy Selfe, Stuart Brown

2. New business (Please send items to me by Feb. 15.)

DUES

Dues ($10 for 2 years): Make dues payable to "Doctoral Consortium in Rhetoric and Composition." For those institutions needing a Tax ID number, it is 35-192-1404TT. (Send to Janice Lauer.)

Best,

Janice M. Lauer
Co-ordinator
From: Catherine Hothers
See you Thursday!

Dear Janice,

Jane and I want to give you our report on the index. I have been put on the Executive Committee of Coalition for Women Scholars & therefore have to go help with that session.

Progress Report
The index of masters’ theses & doctoral dissertations is well under way. The design & conceptualization is finished. All abstracts & citations are in machine-readable form. Software & hardware have been chosen.

Web site
The web site, [Agora, for marketplace], is up. The address is http://www.uoknor.edu/casl/english/agora

Please have a look and help us finish the project by giving us your feedback. We also welcome new dissertation listings.

Jane Moring will speak on the project at 9:50 on Saturday.

We may finish by end of summer. We are applying for grants, as Jane is finishing her program. We will need funding to finish all input & keep the index.
Art, Sciences, then look towards 

A 

WWW: WORKER 

www: worker 

Education ...
Intro/history, 3 years in its current form - look for common sources of support.

Now a list of about 60 programs at this meeting in this program. Not a good time. Split loyalties.

Women in research. No wonderful time for this purpose. Accomplish things that none of us could do alone. Support each other. Only us - no external org.

Anything that gets done we do.

Progress. Our numbers are our strength. Some accomplishments.

If any add agenda items, please let me know.
Take a moment to review address list. Please leave changes with Tim.

I hope we can soon have everyone on line Cindy Selfe set up our list serve.
We have a home page & web site

This is our org so everyone should contribute.

A couple of meetings ago we agreed to collect dues I don't have $ for mailing so it's for that
STATIONERY

I have a weak version of stationery. We could get copies of it that we could use.

Does anyone want to use our # for that?

Reddick - Good idea - not expensive. It makes us look like something.
Bob Johnson - Looks good as is.

moved

2nd

All in favor move

Opposed: None

PASSED - Do the stationery as is

Susan Miller - Do we need permission to use?

JL - That's true. Why not a prayer for that?

Bob Johnson - I don't think it will be a problem

JL - if you would like copies, leave the # you want with Tim. It might help with surveys.

Dues - pay Tim also. It's a # of accounts in your correspondence.

Stuart Brown - suggest - $0/year. Can't keep track

JL - $5/year We don't need that much
HOME PAGE

Exclusively Hobbes-Jernarling offered to do a home page with dissertations attached to it. Each program was asked to send lists. New programs don't have any yet. That needs to be continually late.

LH's report

- see attached

lists are one

Jama is talking about the project on SET in OS

The web site is also up - the address is there

What LH & JH would like is any feedback:

- problems, suggestions, enhancements

LH: Diss's in progress or only finished ones.

JL: At the time we said only finished ones, but what is your list with

LH: It occurred to me that people might be working on similar topics

SH: Put proposals w. e-mail?

Lisa McClure

Suggestion: I've been working on networking good students.

I set up a database from 3 schools. May answer in another forum. Could we gather that in to

SH: Could put it out on consortium list

JL: Let's send around another copy of address list

ACTION JL: Put it on list serve if you don't have it there
Send directly to website

Info on rates website - how to subscribe

Consortium list serv

How about a list of where students have been hired

Our website trying to set up a clearing house of course, socio-
curriculum & then have links to your program

Mock ups - see attached adapted from Plot Rev

Program description

Recent grads

Pert, Statistics

Curriculum

Financial support

Grad fees

Course descriptions

Grad fees interests

Leach River

Lance can't do the html coding, you'll have to do that.

LeachRoad UNIX user case sensitive. AIX 3.2.4

Capital letters must be used always in secure space.

Write to Lance

seriph9k@siu.edu

lisam@ slang@
Send it to use in a file in an e-mail correspondence he will upload it. Gradual process.

Bob Johnson - We may want to think about types of info upon web bc may be used neg as well as pos. Our program just went through a rigorous review.

# of applicants

Job placement statistics

May not be "true", may play in your favor or not

LMC - We could leave that out.

Bob - Mine is more state legislators -

FL - Maybe it's the publicity of the forum

JL - The list serv is less public

Rob - My board of regents has that info anyway

JL - Ohio just went through a terrible review, not so much in rhetoric, but in other fields. So this is what he's referring to. I hope it doesn't spread... we may want to get into this later.

Also has really done a lot of work for the content of the field & knowledgeable.

We have decided not to put graphics for space reasons. Another choice you have to make.

Basic info at our site at more e-lab at years of mirror providing website is duplicate.
JL, some value in having some format for students to look them.

SB: Maintenance & update - will you do?

LHC: As long as we have support.

JL: At least you could update yours & send to us.

JL: Would you please send your recently diss's directly to Catherine.

John: Abstracts?

JL: Advantage?

John: Not partic -

JL: W. Title can find.

SH: #'s? For Abstracts -

RL: It takes awhile.

JL: We've now talked about A & C.

REPORT on SUBJECT CATEGORIES -

Linda: F-B? Now that it's on line, easier to find, but nothing titled Rhetoric or Rhetorical. In Eric.

SH: Under 500 titles of diss's to see how they fit.

Then tried new terms, not attached to them. They collapsed. Better if them (The diss's) fit into subject's could take a long time to develop.

But could encourage their's to write specific abstracts & have specific titles AND to have everyone enter theirs into ERIC.
it meets our needs
we could hash our terms on line.
It would be great to get DAI on our side to rationalize the whole thing.
our terms are buried in DAI. I'm concerned about what happens after this meeting.

What about a whole year.

How much trouble would be to go for the most general descriptors we can all agree
on? Or let's be empowered to write a letter
to DAI asking them to include descriptors on behalf of our org.

SM Terms?
RL Rhetoric and Composition
?

A category under Ed - reading - writing

Then creative writing

Luw - merit to Rhet comp. Which cat is it going
to go under?

Put in parts

RL - have propose to DAF
Ed

(Referral w. Long & Lit)
Center for Rhetoric & Composition
Discussion

Rhetoric & Cultural Studies

If you felt it went more under Lang & Lit, it could go there.

Rob: Sherman, we're saying this is a disc. Rhet & CS is interdisciplinary. If R+CS is in the disciplinary, we need that in the wording.

LWP: We may be having this as a very broad wording—It doesn't preclude others. The Q: is do we want this. We can ask them for another term.

To use R+CS doesn't mean everything has to go under it. This is humanities & Soc. Stud.

Is there an category of "interdisciplinary" Don't want to be under Humanities & Soc. Stud.

Rhet & Comp might do better under Lang & Lit.

Myron: This is a very weak set of descriptors (DPIs)

ERIC should be over

All in favor—Passed, opposed no, abstentions none.
Next move. Second place is against. This is a conservative org. They keep putting rhetoric in but under law, so I'd argue we put it as equal 'Lang + lit'.

John: That makes sense — we could ask to have a left-justified one.

John: Politically org'd classification system. Placed out to left of 'Lang'. Placed under 'Lang'. Line heading parallel to lang. Sit left and center. "Lad" up in bold heading.

Mike: Linguistics in bold headings. Then ‘Rhet’ underneath.

A few V opposed no objections. I'll compose it. JL will sign it.

JL: Other terms?

LWP: I’ve changed my mind. It’s classified here under the discipline, not subject. It’s more likely to get it through with lots of subject.

SM: I’ve never met DAI - but I’m assuming they might write back. I begin a negotiation. I’d like to see this as our empowering you to begin the negotiation.

Agreed.
see attached handout
so you could see it. You can + see whole data base at once + program sep in case & more,

Right now most expedient way. Put it on EXCEL and attach it to Web site. So you can download it. If you send me your data base, we'll add it in Lisa.m@siu.edu

Paul Hanieri is not able to be here. Planning a technology & conf summer 97 can report that 9 school social in the fall. 2 meeting 3 hr driving range. A wonderful opportunity for all.

Penn State + Maryland have had 2
LWP Syracuse has a 5-school project - no other range, but a way to start regional networking. Lots of difficulties. Everyone very busy.
Didnt start to get going until grad students start copy's

New England + grants are connecting - 5 that now linked admin
Meeting Notes
Non UBC

JC Shool faculty?
Carol Berkey: we're sharing for C, NH state. U. Toronto
Ad hoc basis

JC: something else... developing doctoral programs?
LWP: have been develop a doctoral program - now in front of committees. 1st program to go forward from Human Sci in 30 years. Not extremely urgent to have this consortia surveys & other work. I could refer to the consortia as an individual + 5 programs in region.
People who were prepared to say no
I would like to make myself available to others doing program reviews or develop programs

JC: a program review & support committee set up?
It would be good to
Stuart Brown: We did this last year & I was asked to head it up. We discovered we needed a survey committee of 3. LWP, Cindy Self, Stuart Brown

ACTION
Survey

38% response rate. Only 24 programs of 75
so I feel a little uncomfortable (making generalizations)
The projections I made about collapse of job market hasn't happened yet, but I still see it.
We aren't doing a very good job of preparing
Our stats for job market. I would be happy to talk to anyone. Hope happy to give a get survey to from you. It went out in October.

Just - can we send it back incomplete.

SB: I teach survey design & I learned is screwed up in certain ways.

JL: Talk about ultimate plans when you get enough.

SB: Therefore, I'll have agreed to co-author a official.

Only thing I can extrapolate is we're very different.

JL: On list serv?

SB: I could...

dist. Just print it off.

LMLC: Do you have a list?

Carol: It's very import to have that in asap.

for working w. sta is going to job market. doing things before they go on. MLA is useless.

JL: I received a call from Richard Young. Proposed that we do a survey every other year. Knowing what is...
I'm trying to establish a baseline
of how we need desperately a profile who goes into
tenure track, part-time, etc.,
where, # of people, how many,
by program, by program trend,
but cumulative not
in how many full-time positions
entry level but not tenure track position,
& we still seem to be placing our R/C sta's in tenure track
2. In M.A. & PhD
3. Every year I count in Oct. MLA list & I haven't
seen a serious decline, however something much
more (comprehensive needs to be done)
Are you willing to do it? More secure

Seane Fingalter: 100 people surveyed
S.B.: Roughly 22 schools rejected PhD's 80 students
37 PhD granting 25 - MA programs 44 within emphasis
if I multiply = 240

2002, far before
180 before

I'm not seeing comparable increase in jobs

R.S. But if you break down by institution 2nd & 3rd hires,
I think there are other trends.
We have a replacement line to new line
or lit people taking R/L comp jobs - now people
want R/L specialists. We're still doing pretty well.

LWP: I've been AHE New Pathways project in there
at new alternatives. I think you should keep a
sharp eye. I think tenure may collapse, that at
all institutions.

SB: We need to rethink our curricula be w/ training
people to replicate us - there may not be jobs like
that.

JL: Lisa's work will help us. Next year (we can look
at for work)

John: The committee LWP (set up) - related to program
eval.

JL: Would you launch that on the listserv?

LWP: We could incorporate it

JL: Could we hear about it next year?

LFB: Will formulate a presentation on R/L categories.