ACADEMIC SENATE AGENDA  
December 2, 2013

1. CALL TO ORDER: 3:00 p.m. in 110 SFEBB
2. MINUTES: November 4, 2013
3. REQUEST FOR NEW BUSINESS:
4. CONSENT CALENDAR
   a. Appendix I: Resignations, Administrative and Faculty Appointments
   b. Appendix II: Career-line, Adjunct and Visiting Faculty Appointments
   c. Appendix III: Emeritus Appointments
5. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE REPORT
6. REPORT FROM ADMINISTRATION
7. REPORT FROM ASUU
8. NOTICE OF INTENT
   a. Updated Senate Committee Charges (Formal Proposal to revise policy 6-002 due to Senate January 6, 2014)
9. DEBATE CALENDAR
   a. Diversity Committee ex-officio additions
   b. Undergraduate Certificate in Hazards and Emergency Management
   c. Academic Calendar Changes
   d. Student Textbook Savings Ad hoc Committee
   e. Proposal for Writing and Rhetoric Studies Department
10. INFORMATION CALENDAR
    a. Proposal for Emphasis for Master of Music — String Performance & Pedagogy
11. NEW BUSINESS
    a. November 2013 President’s Report
    b. 2014 University Distinguished Teaching Awards
12. ADJOURNMENT
Call to Order
The regular meeting of the Academic Senate, held on November 4, 2013, was called to order at
3:03 p.m. by Allyson Mower, Senate President. The meeting was held in room 110 Spencer Fox
Eccles Business Building.

Present: David Ailion, Peter Alfeld, Chrisoula Andreou, Keith Bartholomew, Tim Benvegnu,
Michael Blomgren, Kelly Bricker, Nilufer Cagatay, Tully Cathey, Thomas Cheatham, Marcus
Chen, Mary Ann Christison, Robin Craig, Kevin DeLuca, Alison Denyer, Justin Diggle, Maria
Dobozy, Megan Dolle, Florence Fernandez, Ole Fischer, Sabine Fuhrmann, Jennifer Garvin,
William Gershan, Jordan Gerton, Franz Goller, Joan Gregory, Gary Grikscheit, Thad Hall,
Michael Harris, Mary Elizabeth Hartnett, Leanne Hawken, Rachel Hayes-Harb, Tom Henderson,
Robert Hitchcock, Thunder Jalili, Anne Jamison, Xan Johnson, William Johnson, Bradley Katz,
John Longino, Theresa Martinez, Ashley McMullin, Heather Melton, Duncan Metcalf, Marco
Marti, Ashley McMullin, Heather Melton, Duncan Metcalf, Meredith Metzger, Joel Miller, Jill Mordi, Alfred Mowdood, Patricia Murphy, A. Chris
Nelson, Ingrid Nygaard, Sam Ortiz, Marlene Plumlee, Matthew Potolsky, M. Pollie Price,
Mariana Ramiro, Lorie Richards, Stephanie Richardson, Steve Roens, Gerald Root, Gary Rose,
Jody Rosenblatt, Clough Shelton, Debra Simmons, Gregory Smoak, David Stevenson, Taylor
Thurman, Rachel Wootton, Joanne Yaffe, Jingyi Zhu

Absent: Orly Alter, McKay Allred, A.K. Balaji, Lyda Bigelow, Marjorie Chan, John Conboy,
William Crowley, Sierra Debenham, Xiao Fang, Francis Friedrich, Michael Hawkins, Jared
Hurdman, Christian Johnson, Amy Johnas, Lori Kowaleski-Jones, Evert Lawton, Uri
Loewenstein, William Lowrance, Raina Mahanes, Ross Marabella, Erminia Martinez, Jannah
Mather, Dragan Milicic, Patrick Panos, Wanda Pillow, Paul Shami, John Paul Soares, Li Wang

Excused: Steve Alder, Harriet Hopf, Vivian Lee, David Pershing

Ex-officio: Robert Flores, Robert Fujinami, Paul Mogren, Allyson Mower, Ruth Watkins, Amy
Wildermuth, Shawnee Worsley

Excused with Proxy: Christina Porucznik (Lisa Green)

Others: David Kieda, Laura Snow

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the Academic Senate meeting on October 7, 2013 were approved.

Request for New Business
The following items of New Business will be discussed:
• BoardDocs Software
• University Diversity Committee
• Academic Senate meeting location
Consent Calendar
The resignations retirements, and faculty and administrator appointments dated September 9, 2013, received approval to forward to the Board of Trustees.

Report from Administration
Ruth Watkins, Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs spoke to the Academic Senate on recent activities. President Pershing is currently visiting the Songdo, Korea campus to visit with government officials, students and parents. The Songdo Campus is anticipated opening in 2014. Dr. Watkins has been visiting with faculty at each college on how to advance the institution’s initiatives. Converging themes and areas of importance include faculty advancement, student scholarships, promoting success of students, and improvements in infrastructures. These items will be forwarded to working groups. Graduation rates continue to be a focus of one of the working groups along with budgets, roles and processes.

Executive Committee Report
Robert Fujinami, Academic Senate Past President, provided a summary of the Executive Committee meeting held October 21, 2013.

Report from ASUU
Sam Ortiz, ASUU President, gave an update on ASUU’s initiatives. ASUU is working with Belinda Saltiban, Director of Inclusion, to create a video for students to share their experiences on campus when they felt discriminated against or felt unsafe. The video will also include best practices for inclusion and can be used to help improve student experiences. ASUU will be partnering with Marriott Library again this semester for Geek Week. This event will include Yoga in the library, Pizza and other great prizes for students.

Notice of Intent
Robert Fujinami presented the proposal for Revised Policy 8-002 School of Medicine Faculty Parental Benefits-Leaves of Absence. This is one of two University Policies on faculty parental benefits, the other (6-315) covers faculty outside the School of Medicine, and this Policy being revised (8-002) covers only faculty of the School of Medicine. One of the most important changes will change the funding model for the pay faculty members receive during a parental leave of absence. The proposed changes will allow the School of Medicine to take advantage of the National Institute of Health parental leave policy. This would allow faculty members with federal grant support to use grant funds to support the leave. In addition, the rate of pay will increase up to the NIH salary cap ($179,700 for FY 2014). Having a uniform paid parental leave policy is seen by the Liaison Committee of Medical Education as an important contribution by the School of Medicine toward an inclusive work environment. Accreditation by that Liaison Committee is vital, and an important factor in accreditation is the School’s ability to demonstrate commitment to policy and processes that support diversity and inclusion. There is some urgency to have the revised Policy approved and implemented by January 1, due in part to the accreditation process underway. Questions were raised about the differences between this Policy governing the School of Medicine faculty and Policy 6-315 governing all other faculty, and in particular the difference in eligibility of career-line faculty. It was explained that the issue of extending benefits for career-line faculty outside the School of Medicine is being examined by the task force on career-line faculty (which is also participating in various other Policy revision
projects that will be processed later in this academic year). The motion to move from Intent to Debate was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Xan Johnson. Motion passed unanimously. The motion to approve and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Jennifer Garvin. Motion passed unanimously.

Debate Calendar
The proposal for a name change from the Department of Orthopedics to the Department of Orthopaedics (adding an “a”) was presented by Dr. Charles Saltzman. The department wishes to update terminology to be more current and in line with the profession. This change will align the department’s name with the American Board of Orthopaedic Surgery, The American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgery, and the American Orthopaedic Association. There will not be any changes in degree titles. The motion to approve and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Jennifer Garvin. Motion passed unanimously.

The proposal from the Department of Exercise and Sport Science for a name change of its undergraduate emphasis, from Fitness Leadership Emphasis to Fitness and Wellness Specialist Emphasis, was presented by Kerry Jacques. This name change will align the emphasis with the current job market and terminology current to the field. This will make it easier to determine which professional area the candidate has expertise in and professional preparation for. This name change will also better reflect the content of the emphasis coursework and skill development. The motion to approve and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Mary Elizabeth Hartnett. Motion passed unanimously.

The proposal for a name change from the Department of Ophthalmology, to the Department of Ophthalmology and Visual Sciences was presented to the Academic Senate. This new name is consistent with a national trend. The department feels the name more fairly represents what they do. This change will not affect or change the structure, faculty or staff. No new physical facilities or modifications will be needed. The motion to approve and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Mary Elizabeth Hartnett. Motion passed unanimously.

Laura Snow, as co-chair of the University Commencement Committee, presented the proposal for Academic Calendar Changes. This proposed calendar change is in response to the feedback that has been received from the recent change in scheduling of the annual Commencement ceremony, to occur on a Thursday evening rather than on Friday morning. The only negative feedback was that on Thursday night some graduating students were taking finals, which conflicted with their participating in the Commencement activities. The administration would like to eliminate the April 24th reading day and to have the final exam period Thursday, April 24th to Wednesday, April 30th. This would ensure finals to be completed prior to the Thursday May 1st Commencement & Convocation Exercises. A lengthy discussion was held regarding the scheduling of finals, the providing of a reading day, and the impact this has on students. The motion to move to table this matter, and send it back to the commencement committee for further study and preparation was made by Chris Nelson. The motion was seconded by Thad Hall. Motion passed. Revote was called by Stephanie Richardson. Motion was restated as motion to
table this matter and send back to the committee to address the issue of reading day. The motion was seconded by Thad Hall. Motion passed.

The proposal for the Center for Latin American Studies was presented by Rebecca Horn and Claudio Holzner. The Center aims to increase knowledge, understanding, and awareness of Latin American countries, cultures and languages though multidisciplinary and multi-institutional collaborative activities. The Center will collaborate with the current Latin American Studies Program, which will continue to administer its academic programs. The Latin American Studies Program is one of several area studies programs at the University that seek to contribute to the internationalization of the campus and ensure that the university continues to evolve into a globalized institution. Concerns were raised about the adequacy of consultation regarding this proposal with faculty in the Languages and Literature department, which would have a close relationship with the new Center and its activities. There was lengthy discussion about how such consultation with affected faculty should occur in developing a proposal for a Center, and how it should be documented within proposal materials. The motion to approve and forward to the Board of Trustees was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Theresa Martinez. A motion to table was made by Maria Dobozy and seconded by Pollie Price, and that motion did not pass. A motion to have the proposal proponents obtain and add to the materials a letter of support from the chair of the Languages and Literature department was made by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Thad Hall, and that motion did not pass. The original motion to approve and forward to the Board of Trustees was restated, by Joanne Yaffe and seconded by Theresa Martinez, and was voted on. Division of house was called due to closeness of the voice-vote. The motion passed.

Howard Horwitz, Chair of the Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee, presented a memo of support to be sent from the Senate, as prepared by Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee, supporting the Utah System of Higher Education Budget Request for this year. This letter of support will be sent to the State Board of Regents. The motion was made by Xan Johnson and seconded by Laurie Richards to approve sending this memo to the Regents. Motion passed.

Information Calendar
The following items were presented for the information and recommendations of the Academic Senate, no questions or recommendations were raised, and all items will be forwarded to the Board of Trustees:

- Undergraduate Emphasis in Animation
- Graduate Council Review Department of Sociology
- Graduate Council Review Department of Pharmacotherapy
- Graduate Council Review Department of English
- Graduate Council Review Department of Pathology

New Business
Allyson Mower discussed using a proprietary computer software product/service, BoardDocs, to distribute the Academic Senate Agenda. The senators had questions about the need for such a product, but were in support of doing a trial of the software.
The University Diversity Committee has requested a change in the charge to include two additional ex-officio members; Director of LGBT Resource Center and Assistant VP for Human Resources.

Meeting space for Spring 2014 was discussed. Meetings for January, February and March will be held in Eccles Health Sciences Education (HSEB) 1750. April and May meeting space will be determined at a later date.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 5:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Shawnee Worsley
Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights Committee

1. The Academic Freedom and Faculty Rights Committee consists of twelve members elected by the Senate from the university faculty members (tenure-line and career-line) other than ex officio members of the Senate.

2. In addition to its role, prescribed in Section 11 of this policy, the committee will oversee the application and updating of the Policy 6-316 Code of Faculty Responsibility and will review for Senate consideration all legislative matters concerning faculty rights and responsibilities.
October 3, 2013

To:
Allyson Mower, Senate President

From:
AFFR Committee

Re:
Inclusion of Career Line Faculty

Dear Allyson and the Executive Committee of the Senate;

The AFFR Committee met on October 1, 2013. As part of our agenda we discussed the inclusion of Career Line faculty on this committee. We are one of the few committees that currently have Career Line faculty representation. We feel it is important for this to continue, and would like to emphasize our collective opinion that there is a need for enhanced policy, and clarity about the rights and responsibilities of career line faculty within the University of Utah. Opportunities exist for tenure line faculty to have their concerns addressed beyond the departmental and college level, for example the Consolidated Hearing Committee (CHC), and the University Promotion and Tenure Committee (UPTAC). Currently there are minimal venues for addressing similar faculty concerns expressed by career line faculty beyond the departmental and college level. Continuing the voice of Career Line faculty on AFFR is a step towards the goal of recognizing issues of importance to all faculty that carry out the missions of the University of Utah.

Respectfully submitted;

Margaret F Clayton, PhD APRN
Chair, AFFR Committee
Proposed changes to charge:

Academic Senate Policy Advisory Committee
1. The Academic Policy Advisory Committee consists of eight nine tenure-line and career-line faculty members and three students. Faculty members shall be elected by the Senate for two three-year terms, with four three of these terms beginning each June 16. Student members shall be selected for one-year terms in accordance with Procedures established by the ASUU, with terms beginning each June 16.
2. The Academic Policy Advisory Committee is authorized to consider any matter relating to academic policy which may be suggested by members of the committee, members of the faculty, administrative officers, or students. Upon its selection of a subject for study, the committee shall notify all interested agencies within the university, including standing committees, and invite their cooperation. At least once each academic year, the committee shall submit a written report of its studies and recommendations, if any, to the Senate.

The proposed changes that are being recommended to the Senate Executive Committee are justified below. Numbers 1, 3 and 4 are interdependent.

1) Nine members: A change is suggested to increase the committee membership by one member in order to accommodate an equal number of members to rotate on and off each year.
2) Tenure-line and career-line: A change is made to the language of the charge to specifically include career-line faculty.
3) Three-year terms: A change in member term-length is suggested in order to (a) not only accommodate an equal number of members to rotate on and off each year, (b) but also allow members additional time (i.e., an additional year of service) on the committee to become more familiar and knowledgeable with APAC’s activities, especially for an incoming chair.
4) Three of these terms: A change is suggested to replace three members each year in order to accommodate an equal number of members to rotate on and off each year.
1. The Annuities and Salaries Committee—Salaries and Benefits Committee consists of six members of the regular faculty (consisting of both career-line and tenure-line faculty), elected by the Academic Senate to serve for three-year terms. The terms of two committee members shall end each year on June 15, and the terms of newly elected committee members shall begin on June 16. Members of the committee shall represent the university faculty as a whole and not any particular area or college. The Director of Human Resources—Chief Human Resources Officer shall be an ex officio nonvoting member of the committee.

2. The Annuities and Salaries Committee—Salaries and Benefits shall function in a research and advisory capacity and shall report to the Senate and from time to time make recommendations to the Senate on matters relating to sabbatical leaves, salaries, salary schedules, cost of living, faculty retirement plans, annuities, health and life insurance, and other benefits. The committee shall not, however, exercise budgetary or administrative powers in relation to these subjects. The committee shall advise the administration on matters pertaining to annuities and salaries and report the advice they gave to the next regular meeting of the Senate.
12 October 2013

TO: Academic Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Howard Horwitz, chair, Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee

SUBJECT: Career line membership on Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee

The Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee is aware that Career line faculty shall receive representation on Senate committees proportionate to their representation in the Academic Senate. At this time, no Career line faculty serve on the Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee, which has eight members. We request that at the first available opportunity, the Personnel and Elections Committee should please include Career line faculty on ballots to fill openings on FBPAC.

Respectfully submitted,

Howard Horwitz
Department of English
Chair, Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee
Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee

1. The Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee consists of eight members of the regular faculty (tenure-line and career-line), elected by the Academic Senate to serve four-year terms. The terms of two committee members shall end each year on June 15, and the terms of newly elected members shall begin on June 16. Members of the committee shall represent the university faculty as a whole and not any particular area or college. Not more than two committee members may be from the same area or college.

2. Despite the general duties assigned to the Personnel and Elections Committee, all nominations for the Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee, except nominations made from the floor during a formally convened meeting of the Academic Senate, shall originate from the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate.

3. The Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee may establish its own rules which shall provide that individual faculty members are entitled to submit information to the committee, that no committee member is permitted to participate in discussions or to vote on matters directly affecting the member's own college, and that committee members will hold in strict confidence all budget information which the committee receives on a confidential basis from the university president or other administrative officers of the university.

4. The Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee should respond to directions from the Academic Senate, while retaining the freedom to set its own agenda. The committee's principal role is one of consultation with the university administration, and of presenting and arguing for the views and interests of the whole faculty in the administration's long-range academic and budgetary planning. The committee should strive to persuade the administration to make critical budgetary and academic policy decisions in as open and public a way as possible.

5. The Faculty Budget and Planning Advisory Committee shall perform the functions assigned to it by applicable provisions of Policy 6-313 - opens new window, University Regulations, Section 5.
Library Policy Advisory Committee

1. The Library Policy Advisory Committee consists of one faculty (tenure-line or career-line) representative from each College and one from the University Libraries elected by the Academic Senate for three-year terms, and six students (including at least one graduate student) selected by ASUU. The directors of the Marriott Library, the Eccles Health Sciences Library, and the S.J. Quinney Law Library are ex officio, non-voting members of the committee.

2. The Library Policy Advisory Committee confers with and advises directors of the Marriott Library, the Eccles Health Sciences Library, and the S.J. Quinney Law Library concerning library policies and practices. It provides liaison between the libraries and the faculty and student body. The Library Policy Advisory Committee reports to the Academic Senate and the cognizant vice presidents.
Personnel and Elections Committee

1. The Personnel and Elections Committee consists of eighteen persons elected by the Senate from its members, and shall include one faculty representative (tenure-line or career-line) from each Senate area of representation and two students. Faculty shall be elected for three-year terms. A member of the Personnel and Elections Committee must be a senator at the time of election, but can remain on the Personnel and Elections Committee for three years even though his or her term of service on the Senate may expire during that three-year period of time. The number of career-line faculty shall not exceed the number of tenure-line faculty on the P&E Committee. The President of the Senate, may serve, at the election of the committee, as its chair.

2. This committee shall make nominations for elected standing committees of the Senate and for all other Senate committees, and if the Senate is requested to make nominations or recommendations for a committee to be appointed by the university administration, the Personnel and Elections Committee shall prepare the list of nominees. It will review university standing committees on a 5-year rotating schedule. This review will use self-study Procedures, and include an assessment of perceived appropriateness of committee membership, charter, functions, meetings and others. The committee shall review any new university-wide standing committee charters or changes to university standing committee charters. In alternate years, it will apportion Senate membership according to Section 2.B.1.b. of this policy. The committee will also review the necessity of retaining existing university committees, recommending to the Senate any possible excisions. It shall pursue an affirmative action program to secure significant representation of women, minorities, and nontenured career-line ranks in positions of responsibility within the university, and to seek a distribution of committee nominations among colleges and departments in order to obtain a range of backgrounds among the members of each committee.
1. Membership. The University Diversity Committee will consist of 12 members of the regular faculty (6 tenure-line faculty and 6 career-line faculty), 3 staff members, and 3 student members. The faculty members will be elected by the Senate for three year terms. The staff members will be nominated by UUSAC and approved by the Senate Executive Committee for three year terms. The student members shall be selected for one year terms in accordance with Procedures established by the ASUU. Terms will begin each August 1. Non-voting ex-officio members shall include: Associate VP for Diversity, Associate VP for Diversity for Health Sciences, UUSAC Chair, ASUU President, Academic Senate Past-president, Director of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action, and two representatives from the community. The Chair of the University Diversity Committee will be invited to serve by the Senate President, with installation (vote) by the committee each year.

2. Charge. This committee shall provide leadership and expertise to the University of Utah community in promoting diversity in their various roles and activities; serves as a forum for the exchange of ideas within the University. The University Diversity Committee should respond to directions from the Academic Senate, while retaining the freedom to set its own agenda. The committee's principal role is to identify issues, projects, and proposals that would further a positive climate of diversity on the University of Utah campus, would enhance relations with diverse elements in the community, and would promote appreciation of diversity in the wider community. The committee's role includes forwarding information and recommendations to the Academic Senate. The committee will submit an annual report to the Academic Senate of its activities.

3. Budget. An annual budget will be offered by the President and administered by the Office of the Associate Vice President for Diversity.
1. Membership. The University Retention Promotion and Tenure Standards Committee voting membership shall consist of sixteen tenured faculty members, with one faculty representative from each Senate area of representation elected for three-year terms by the Academic Senate and six career-line faculty members, elected for three year terms with no more than one representative per college. These faculty members may be divided into two subcommittees, one to review tenure-line RPT standards and the second to review career-line review standards. The Associate Vice President for Faculty, or designee, shall be a non-voting ex officio member. Voting members shall be elected as follows:
   1. Nominations will be proposed in advance by the Personnel and Elections Committee, and additional nominations of eligible faculty members who have agreed to serve may be made from the floor immediately prior to the election. Voting will be by preferential ballot.
   2. Members of the University Retention Promotion and Tenure Standards Committee Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee will not be eligible for nomination for another term until an interval of one year has passed following the completion of their term on the committee.
   3. In each successive year, the Personnel and Elections Committee shall include among its nominations for the University Retention Promotion and Tenure Standards Committee two or more candidates whose tenured or career-line faculty appointments are in colleges whose current member is rotating off the committee.

2. Vacancies. If vacancies occur in the University Retention Promotion and Tenure Standards Committee Senate Faculty Review Standards Committee, they shall be filled either by the runner-up from the original elections or, if that is not possible, by special elections conducted in the Academic Senate by the Personnel and Elections Committee.

3. Duties. See University Policy 6-305 (Duties of University Retention, Promotion and Tenure Standards Committee).
Council Approval

Note: This form is intended to track the progress of a proposal (whether from Academic Affairs or Health Sciences) through the Undergraduate and Graduate Councils.

Proposal: Certificate in Hazards and Emergency Management

This proposal needs to go through:

Undergraduate Council  X
Graduate Council
Both Approvals
Grad Approval/Undergrad Notification

This proposal has been approved by:

Chair of Undergraduate Council  Date: 11/7/2013
Chair of Graduate Council  Date:

Once the appropriate signature(s) have been obtained, please forward this completed form to the Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs. (NOTE: The SVP-AA is the Chief Academic Office for the University of Utah and reports to the Board of Regents in this capacity. When necessary, the CAO will get a signature from the SVP-HSC.)

Chief Academic Officer  Date: 11/11/13

Once the Chief Academic Officer’s signature has been obtained, this approval document will be forwarded to the Office of the Academic Senate.
Institution Submitting Request: University of Utah
Proposed Title: Hazards and Emergency Management Certificate
Currently Approved Title:
School or Division or Location: College of Social and Behavioral Science
Department(s) or Area(s) Location: Geography
Recommended Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code¹ (for new programs): 45.0702
Current Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code (for existing programs):
Proposed Beginning Date (for new programs): 08/01/2014
Institutional Board of Trustees' Approval Date:

Proposal Type (check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regents' General Consent Calendar Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R401-5 OCHE Review and Recommendation; Approval on General Consent Calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECTION NO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Requires “Section V: Program Curriculum” of Abbreviated Template

Chief Academic Officer (or Designee) Signature:
I certify that all required institutional approvals have been obtained prior to submitting this request to the Office of the Commissioner.

Signature
__________________________
Date:
__________________________

Printed Name:
__________________________

¹ CIP codes must be recommended by the submitting institution. For CIP code classifications, please see http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/Default.aspx?y=55.
Section I: Request

The Geography Department at the University of Utah proposes to develop an undergraduate certificate program in Hazards & Emergency Management. The proposed certificate was provided to all Geography Department faculty via email in September 2013 for review. Suggestions received were incorporated and the proposal was discussed at the September 6, 2013 faculty meeting and subsequently approved. The proposed certificate takes advantage of the existing curriculum in hazards and emergency management in Geography along with courses in other departments on campus to provide an interdisciplinary, value-added educational opportunity for students that want to increase their knowledge in hazards and emergency management and their marketability for careers requiring this type of expertise.

Section II: Need

Recent disasters including Hurricane Sandy, the Oklahoma Tornadoes, and the Waldo Canyon Wildfire underscore the devastating toll that environmental hazards can take on life and property. Emergency management is the process of applying science, technology, planning, and management to deal with extreme events that can injure or kill large numbers of people, do extensive damage to property, and disrupt community life (Drabek, 1991). As populations in all hazardous areas increase, the need for well-trained emergency managers is growing. Utah is home to many environmental hazards such as extreme weather, earthquakes, flooding, wildfires, landslides, and hazardous materials releases. The University of Utah does not currently have a Certificate or Degree in Hazards & Emergency Management but a number of graduates in Geography and other majors have successfully gained employment in this area in local, state and federal agencies. In many of these cases, entry-level positions involved expertise in the application of geospatial technologies (GIS, remote sensing, or GPS). A formal curriculum in Hazards and Emergency Management would benefit our students by preparing them for a field with growing employment opportunities.

The proposed program will provide students with cutting-edge knowledge about hazards, emergency management, and geospatial technologies. By earning the certificate, students will:

- Understand the fundamentals of environmental hazards and how to reduce their impact.
- Understand the principles of emergency management.
- Develop skills in applying geospatial technologies to managing emergencies.
- Learn about the emergency management phases: mitigation, preparation, response, and recovery.
- Learn about approaches to dealing with terrorism and preserving homeland security.

This certificate would be valuable to a wide range of career options including but not limited to:

- Emergency managers that work in city, county, state, and federal government;
- Emergency managers that work in the private and non-profit sectors;
- Natural, technological, and social hazards researchers, planners, and policy-makers;
Individuals in any field that want to improve their understanding of environmental threats and how to reduce their toll.

The decision to develop the certificate program is based on student and faculty interest and participation in the Department of Geography’s hazards, terrorism, and emergency management courses: Natural Hazards (GEOG 3310/5310), Geography of Terrorism and Security (GEOG 3320/5320), and Geography of Disasters and Emergency Management (GEOG 3340/5340). These classes have steadily grown in total enrollment over the last decade, and students from across campus are well-represented with over 50% coming from majors outside Geography. Majors represented include Anthropology, Atmospheric Sciences, Civil Engineering, Economics, Environmental Studies, Geology and Geophysics, City and Metropolitan Planning and more. Emergency Management is a very interdisciplinary field that is relevant to a wide variety of majors and career options, and an organized curriculum would improve student marketability.

There are no certificate programs in Hazards and Emergency Management in the State of Utah, although there are programs in Fire and Rescue (UVU) and Emergency Medicine (U of U). One similar program was identified at Colorado State University Global Campus. This program [http://csuglobal.edu/educational-programs/lifelong-learning/certificates-of-completion/undergraduate-emergency-management/] consists of 5 classes. Because of this example, we propose a minimum of 5 classes for our certificate.

The certificate as designed is meant be an attribute of an existing course of study for a student or may be earned independently after the successful completion of a bachelor’s degree. It is anticipated that in the future a sufficient number of the courses would be available in an on-line format and the certificate would potentially be offered to non-matriculated students in the context of Continuing Education. As a value-added option for existing students and as a future option for non-matriculated students, this certificate contributes to the governors 66% by 2020 program, the intent of which is to provide Utahns post-secondary educational opportunities to maintain and strengthen our local work force.

Section III: Institutional Impact

The proposed certificate program would be managed in the Geography Department in the College of Social and Behavioral Science at the University of Utah. The core hazards and emergency management coursework has already been developed in this department, and the development of a new certificate will take advantage of the existing infrastructure while providing undergraduates an opportunity to complement their degree with a “value added” component to enhance marketability. As an interdisciplinary certificate, there will be a financial benefit to Atmospheric Sciences, Environmental Studies & Sustainability, Family & Consumer Studies, Geology & Geophysics, and Health Promotion & Education, Political Science, Psychology, and Sociology, as students who might not have taken one of the courses may now do so in pursuit of the certificate. Contact has been made with departments who might have relevant coursework to contribute. Specifically, contact has been made with Dr. Perry from Atmospheric Sciences, Dr. Brown from Family & Consumer Studies, Dr. Solomon from Geology & Geophysics, Dr. Chatelain from Health Promotion & Education, Dr. McCool from Environmental Studies & Sustainability, Dr. Drews from Psychology, Dr. Svedin from Political Science, and Dr. Melton from Sociology who have provided suggestions for coursework.

All required courses are taught at least once per year and there is a commitment from the Geography Department to continue to do so. No new faculty or staff are required, and the program would take advantage of recent faculty additions in Geography. Core emergency management courses in the
Department of Geography are taught by Andrea Brunelle, Larry Coats, Tom Cova, and George Hepner. Because the Department of Geography has experience managing the Geographic Information Science certificate, the new administrative burden is not extensive. The Undergraduate Director will direct the certificate as part of their departmental duties. Students pursuing the Certificate can receive advising from the Undergraduate Director, Department Advisor, or Certificate Director which will reduce the burden on any one person. Courses proposed as electives will be vetted by the Director of the Certificate and must meet the following criteria: 1) offered at the 3000 level or higher, and 2) include at least 2 weeks of material directly related to emergency management that is explicitly indicated on the syllabus. A small interdisciplinary committee of 3 faculty will evaluate changes to the program.

Section IV: Finances

No new costs are associated with the development of this certificate program. Revenue from increased student enrollments will benefit all departments involved.

Section VI: Program Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Course Prefix &amp; Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>GEO 1000 or GEOG 3310</td>
<td>Natural Disasters or Natural Hazards</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEOG 3320</td>
<td>Geography of Terrorism and Homeland Security</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEOG 3340</td>
<td>Geography of Disasters and Emergency Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Electives</td>
<td>ATMOS 1010</td>
<td>Severe and Unusual Weather</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCS 3620</td>
<td>Environment and Behavior</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEO 1030</td>
<td>Earthquakes and Volcanoes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEO 5170</td>
<td>GeoHazards and Engineering Geomorphology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEOG 5215</td>
<td>Climate Change Impacts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEOG 5230</td>
<td>Pyrogeography</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEDU 2720</td>
<td>Emergency Medical Response</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSY 3171</td>
<td>Human Factors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POLS 5965</td>
<td>Crisis Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOC 3569</td>
<td>Terrorism, Violence, and Aggression</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Electives</td>
<td>GEOG 3140</td>
<td>Introduction to Geographic Information Systems (GIS)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(select 1)</td>
<td>GEOG 3110</td>
<td>Earth from Space: Remote Sensing of the Environment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Courses to Be Added in the Next Five Years

Over the last 3 years the core courses have been developed and approved. No new needed courses are planned at this time however new electives can be added per the vetting process described above.
Recommended Program Schedule
The core courses are offered so that the sequence can be completed in 3 semesters (fall, spring, fall sequence). Electives may be taken throughout the sequence, however we will advise that they be taken after the initial core course has been completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Course Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>GEOG 3310 or GEO 1000</td>
<td>Natural Hazards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEOG 3140</td>
<td>Natural Disasters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>GEOG 3340</td>
<td>Geography of Disasters &amp; Emergency Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GEOG 3320</td>
<td>Geography of Terrorism &amp; Homeland Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>Elective 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>Elective 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XXXX</td>
<td>Elective 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
October 21, 2013

Dear Undergraduate Council;

I am writing to express my strongest support for the proposal being submitted by Dr. Tom Cova from the Geography Department for an Undergraduate Certificate in Hazards & Emergency Management.

The certificate program proposal has been reviewed by me and members of my college/department and we feel an appropriate level of inclusion and that any impacts from the certificate to my college/department will be positive.

Regards,

Frank A. Drews, PhD
Associate Professor Cognitive Psychology, University of Utah.
Director of the Center for Human Factors in Patient Safety at the VAMC Salt Lake City
Director of the Human Factors Certificate Program, University of Utah
Adjunct Assistant Professor, Department of Anesthesiology, University of Utah
Adjunct Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology, University of Utah
Adjunct Assistant Professor, Department of Biomedical Informatics, University of Utah
Adjunct Assistant Professor, Internal Medicine, University of Utah
To: Undergraduate Council

From: Dr. Kevin D. Perry, Chair
Department of Atmospheric Sciences
University of Utah

Date: October 22, 2013

Re: Letter of Support for Undergraduate Certificate in Hazards & Emergency Management

I am writing to endorse the proposal being submitted by Dr. Tom Cova from the Geography Department for an Undergraduate Certificate in Hazards & Emergency Management. The certificate program proposal has been reviewed by me and members of my department and we feel an appropriate level of inclusion and that any impacts from the certificate to my department will be positive.

Sincerely,

Dr. Kevin D. Perry
October 15, 2013

Dear Undergraduate Council;

I am writing to endorse the proposal being submitted by Dr. Thomas Cova and the Geography Department for an Undergraduate Certificate in Hazards and Emergency Management. The certificate program proposal has been reviewed by me and members of my college and it has received unanimous approval by all involved. As indicated in Dr. Brunelle’s letter, the certificate builds on the strengths of the geography program’s other certificate programs. The certificate program will be of positive benefit to the college.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Cynthia Berg
Interim Dean
October 19, 2013

Undergraduate Council
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Dear Undergraduate Council;

I am writing to endorse the proposal being submitted by Dr. Thomas Cova for an Undergraduate Certificate in Hazards and Emergency Management. The certificate program proposal has been reviewed by me and members of the Department of Geography and was unanimously approved. The proposed certificate program provides a complement to our other certificates in Climate Change, and Geographic Information Science (GIS), and Geospatial Intelligence. This interdisciplinary certificate also builds on the existing strengths in issues related to natural and anthropogenic hazards and how humans and society respond to them in our department, college and across campus. This certificate will provide students the opportunity to get a focused education in an area that is becoming even more relevant with the impacts global change.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Andrea Brunelle
Associate Professor and Chair
October 21, 2013

Dear Undergraduate Council;

I am writing to endorse the proposal being submitted by Dr. Tom Cova from the Geography Department for an Undergraduate Certificate in Hazards & Emergency Management. The certificate program proposal has been reviewed by me and members of my college/department and we feel an appropriate level of inclusion and that any impacts from the certificate to my college/department will be positive.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Heather C. Melton
Associate Professor
Department of Sociology
University of Utah
801-581-3108
Heather.melton@soc.utah.edu
October 21, 2013

Dear Undergraduate Council,

I am writing to endorse the proposal being submitted by Dr. Tom Cova from the Geography Department for an Undergraduate Certificate in Hazards & Emergency Management. The certificate program proposal has been reviewed by me and members of my college/department and we feel an appropriate level of inclusion and that any impacts from the certificate to my department will be positive.

Sincerely,

Les Chatelain
Interim Department Chair
October 22, 2013

UGS Committee
University of Utah

Dear Colleagues:

We are pleased to provide a letter of support for the proposal from the Geography Department to create a new Undergraduate Certificate in Hazards & Emergency Management. We think this certificate will have considerable appeal to students majoring in Environmental and Sustainability Studies, and thus will have a positive impact on our Program. We have reviewed the proposal and provided feedback, and fully support Dr. Cova's proposal.

Thank you.

Daniel McCool
Professor of Political Science
Director, Environmental and Sustainability Studies Program
Co-director, Sustainability Curriculum Development
October 21, 2013

Dear Undergraduate Council;

I am writing to endorse the proposal being submitted by Dr. Tom Cova from the Geography Department for an Undergraduate Certificate in Hazards & Emergency Management.

The certificate program proposal has been reviewed by me and my department chair Robert Mayer and we feel an appropriate level of inclusion and that any impacts from the certificate to my college/department will be positive.

Sincerely,

Barbara B Brown
October 22, 2013

Prof. Ann Darling
Chair, Undergraduate Council
Sterling Sill Center
195 S Central Campus Drive, RM 00132
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Dear Prof. Darling:

I write to endorse the proposal being submitted by Dr. Tom Cova from the Geography Department for an Undergraduate Certificate in Hazards & Emergency Management. Members of my department and I have reviewed the certificate program proposal and we feel an appropriate level of inclusion, and that any impacts from the certificate to my college/department will be positive.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John M. Bartley
Professor and Chair
Department of Geology and Geophysics
Memorandum

To: Members of the Academic Senate

From: Mary G. Parker, Commencement Co-Chair
Laura Snow, Commencement Co-Chair

Date: November 19, 2013

Re: A revised proposal to discontinue Reading Day on a trial basis for one year

The Commencement Committee is proposing a revised request to the Academic Senate. We are asking that Reading Day be discontinued for the spring 2014 term on a trial basis, with the caveat that a study will be conducted on re-working the Academic Calendar for future spring terms. This revised proposal would allow the Commencement Committee additional time to search for alternatives and solutions to restoring Reading Day including a review of the Academic Calendar and possible changes to the start/end dates while also preserving required instructional days. In addition this extra time would allow for a survey of students and faculty regarding the impact of removing Reading Day.

The Commencement Committee appreciates the guidance of the Academic Senate and looks forward to discussing the new proposal at the next meeting. Please let us know if you would like any additional information.
To: Allyson Mower, Academic Senate President  
Members of the Academic Senate

From: Sam Ortiz, Student Body President

Subject: Academic Calendar Change for Spring 2014

As students at the University of Utah, we have concerns about the tabling of the academic calendar change at Academic Senate on November 4th, 2013. The students at Academic Senate were in favor of passing the proposed academic calendar change and would like to explain our position. Our position has been shaped through speaking with numerous students and student groups from many areas around campus. Not only has the Student Senate and the Student Assembly discussed this change, we have reached out to other students and groups in order to find out their feelings about the possible change.

Since the University of Utah Commencement day and time has changed, this has created a situation where Commencement Day overlaps with the final exams of students across the university. Students are overwhelmingly in favor of the changes made to commencement last year. Having an evening commencement has been helpful for student with families traveling to Salt Lake from out of town, makes it less likely to conflict with work schedules, and evening times allow for more celebration to occur that day. While no formal count of students is taken at commencement, more caps and gowns were purchased last year than in previous years. This indicates that more students likely attended graduation activities.

As representatives of students, we feel it is important to provide ample opportunity for students to attend graduation activities. Commencement is especially important for first generation college students and leaving Reading Day in the Academic Calendar may mean that students will not be able to spend Commencement Day celebrating with their family and friends.

Starting final exams one day earlier through removing Reading Day will solve this problem. Reading day is often times not used as an academic day and is not found in either the Fall or Summer Semester Schedule. Additionally, many classes don’t have finals week exams and do not utilize reading day.

University of Utah administration is working with ASUU to provide resources to help students succeed without Reading Day. We are currently discussing providing information about tutor services on campus, increasing Geek Week support, and other initiatives. We would be pleased to have your input in this process. Please email Rachel Wootton (rwootton@asuu.utah.edu), ASUU Director of Academic Affairs with your questions, comments, or ideas regarding this initiative.

We would like to point out that Commencement has been solidified for the 2013/2014 Academic Year. Our discussion today is not about whether University of Utah Commencement is on Friday or Thursday. Instead, it is a discussion of changing the academic calendar and moving up the
start of final testing by one day. This change will prevent the overlap of final tests and Commencement.

We plan on making a motion to bring back the tabled academic calendar change. As representatives of students, we will be voting in favor of making changes to the academic calendar and we hope you will support us to ensure that students can participate fully in commencement and graduation activities.

Thank you for all of the great work you do on Academic Senate and the work you do to provide a great education for students at the University of Utah.

Signed,

Sam Ortiz  
ASUU Student Body President  
sortiz@asuut.uta.edu

Raina Mahanes  
ASUU Senator  
College of Mines and Earth Science

Rachel Wootton  
ASUU Director of Academic Affairs  
rwootton@asuut.uta.edu

Ross Marabella  
ASUU Senator  
College of Fine Arts

Sierra Debenham  
ASUU Senator  
School of Medicine

Ermina Martinez  
ASUU Senator  
College of Nursing

Megan Dolle  
ASUU Senator  
College of Humanities

Ashley McMullin  
ASUU Senator  
University College

Jared Hurdman  
ASUU Senator  
College of Social and Behavioral Science

John Soares  
ASUU Senator  
College of Law

Amy Johans  
ASUU Senator  
College of Architecture and Metropolitan Planning

Taylor Thurman  
ASUU Senator  
College of Social Work
Proposal to create Student Savings Ad Hoc Committee

Convene: January 2014

Disband: May 2014

Purpose: To provide recommendations to the Senate by May 2014 on how to save students $500/year in textbook costs

Membership: 10 members consisting of four students, four faculty, and two staff selected by ASUU and Senate President
October 23, 2013

TO:    Ruth Watkins  
       Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

FR:    Ann Darling  
       Chair, Undergraduate Council

       David Kieda  
       Chair, Graduate Council

RE:    Departmental Status for Writing and Rhetoric Studies

The Writing and Rhetoric Studies program originally submitted a combined proposal that included (1) changing its status from a program to a department, as well as (2) creating a new BA/BS and (3) changing the name of its existing minor. This combined proposal was approved by the Undergraduate Council (UC) on 11/29/12 and by the Graduate Council (GC) on 1/28/13. When the proposals reached the Academic Senate, that body asked the program to split the proposal into three separate parts. Parts (1) and (2) have already been approved by the Senate.

The Writing and Rhetoric Studies program is now resubmitting the proposal for (1), changing the program to a Department. Since an earlier version of this has already been approved by both the UC and GC, and the revised proposal is only a better and more detailed version of the original, we see no need to review and approve the proposal again.
Institution Submitting Request: University of Utah
Proposed Title: Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies
Currently Approved Title: University Writing Program
School or Division or Location: College of Humanities
Department(s) or Area(s) Location:
Recommended Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code\(^1\) (for new programs): 23.1304
Current Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) Code (for existing programs): 23.1304
Proposed Beginning Date (for new programs): 2014
Institutional Board of Trustees’ Approval Date:

Proposal Type (check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTION NO.</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1.1</td>
<td>Minor*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1.2</td>
<td>Emphasis*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.1</td>
<td>(CER P) Certificate of Proficiency*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2.2</td>
<td>(GCR) Graduate Certificate*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5.4.1       | New Administrative Unit  
               Administrative Unit Transfer  
               Administrative Unit Restructure  
               Administrative Unit Consolidation |
| 5.4.2       | Conditional Three-Year Approval for New Centers, Institutes, or Bureaus |
| 5.4.3       | New Center  
               New Institute  
               New Bureau |
| 5.5.1       | Out-of-Service Area Delivery of Programs |
| 5.5.2       | Program Transfer  
               Program Restructure  
               Program Consolidation |
| 5.5.3       | Name Change of Existing Programs |
| 5.5.4       | Program Discontinuation  
               Program Suspension |
| 5.5.5       | Reinstatement of Previously Suspended Program  
               Reinstatement of Previously Suspended Administrative Unit |

*Requires “Section V: Program Curriculum” of Abbreviated Template

Chief Academic Officer (or Designee) Signature:
I certify that all required institutional approvals have been obtained prior to submitting this request to the Office of the Commissioner.

Signature  
Date: MM/DD/YEAR

Printed Name: Name of CAO or Designee

Section I: The Request

The University of Utah requests approval to create a new Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies effective, July, 2014.

Section II: Program Description

Program Description

The University Writing Program was established to create undergraduate writing courses and to provide teacher training for them, to develop and support writing-across-the-curriculum initiatives, and to develop and enhance graduate work in Writing and Rhetoric Studies, all under the purview of one academic unit. In 1983 the University Academic Senate charged the UWP with the oversight of all curricular initiatives and teaching of writing on campus. Since that time, the UWP has shown consistent growth in its academic mission and in its outreach across the campus and in the community (see Appendix A). Today the UWP has a flourishing 18-credit minor with 30 students, a proposed major currently under review by the Board of Regents (for a list of courses, see Appendix B and for the major plan of study see Appendix C), and a robust graduate degree offered through three departments; twenty four graduate students are enrolled, primarily at the PhD level. Currently faculty members in the UWP are distributed in two departments: Communication and English. Due to mutual research and teaching expertise, we propose to bring all academic faculty who deliver the degrees into one department, Writing and Rhetoric Studies.

The core expertise in Writing and Rhetoric Studies is to teach students the rhetorical skills necessary to use writing to address the needs of an increasingly globalized, international world in which the ability to produce and comprehend texts is an essential part of everyday life. Writing and Rhetoric Studies is beneficial to students who have an interest in the production, circulation, uses, and effects of texts. Not only will students develop substantial writing competency, they will learn about the history of writing, the sociocultural relationship between writing and knowledge dissemination, and the impact of the written word in education, the workplace, and society. Students studying Writing and Rhetoric Studies will be more adept at using rhetorical knowledge to enhance their writing in multiple situations. To prepare students for the twenty-first century, students who major in Writing and Rhetoric Studies will gain facility in the following fields of knowledge:

1. **History and Theory.** Students will identify, understand and explain different historical rhetorical theories and practices.

2. **Social Practices.** Students will identify, understand and explain different contexts for writing (e.g., education, the workplace, and society).

3. **Multimodal Competency.** Students will compose using a variety of multimodal texts, combining print, visual, digital, and other modes of writing.

4. **Writing Competency.** Students will improve understanding of audiences, writing processes, genres, and grammatical structures that fulfill reader expectations.

5. **Information Literacy.** Students will demonstrate the ability to locate, evaluate, and appropriately use sources from a variety of media.
Writing and Rhetoric Studies emphasizes strong analytical and interpretive skills, and critical thinking and problem solving skills. The degree will help students develop:

- knowledge of language and its uses in text (print and digital) production;
- the ability to integrate information by locating appropriate sources and accurately synthesizing them;
- the ability to use evidence from primary and secondary sources to make persuasive, academic arguments;
- knowledge of different types and purposes of technology;
- knowledge of a variety of academic and workplace genres, and the ability to manipulate those genres to meet the demands of new and evolving situations;
- and understanding various uses of writing for different purposes, contexts and readers.

The goal of the department is to bring together faculty with the research and teaching expertise in these areas that currently reside in the two departments (Communication and English).

**Purpose of the Department**

With writing becoming increasingly more critical to communication in a globalized world, students awarded degrees in higher education are expected to write, and write well (see Appendix D). Students across all disciplines are expected to use writing to articulate ideas and concepts to those in their areas of study, and to take that ability into the workplace. In the introduction to the report by The National Commission on Writing, Bob Kerry, President of New School University writes, "individual opportunity in the United States depends critically on the ability to present one’s thoughts coherently, cogently, and persuasively" (2004, p.5). The respondents to the survey overwhelmingly agreed that writing plays an important role in the daily life of employees. Similar in tone, the Association of Colleges and Universities lists writing as one of the “essential learning outcomes” components for intellectual and practical skills for the twenty-first century (p. 12). To adapt to these needs, institutions of higher learning are increasingly developing majors in Writing and Rhetoric Studies.

With growth in majors it has become common for Writing Programs and their faculty cohorts to establish departments of Writing and Rhetoric Studies. Currently, 65 universities and colleges in the United States offer majors in writing and rhetoric. (for a list of departments with majors, see Appendix E.) Departments currently exist in a number of top institutions, including the University of Iowa, the University of Minnesota—Twin Cities, and the University of Texas—Austin.

**Institutional Readiness**

Because the UWP has existed as an independent academic unit since 1983, the transition to the department will be straightforward, creating minimal disruptions for related departments, students, and faculty. All courses currently exist within the UWP and are taught by core Writing Program faculty. Combining the faculty into one department will allow us to consolidate our expertise and streamline the delivery of the major.
Two steps were taken with participating departments: 2) faculty meetings for the Departments of Communication, Education, Culture and Society were attended to discuss the new department and to answer any questions and 2) meetings were held or are scheduled with the six departments in the College of Humanities.

Faculty
There are five-tenure-track faculty members, eight lecturer positions of varying ranks, five associate instructors, and two adjunct faculty members (biosketches are in Appendix F). This complement of instructors currently teaches courses at both the undergraduate and graduate level. Thus the number of faculty we currently have is adequate to cover the major and minor, as well as the courses we offer to graduate students across campus. Core staffing for the new department (including the major, minor, and Writing Program Administration) will consist of its current configuration: five tenure-track faculty, two adjunct faculty; eight auxiliary faculty, and five associate instructors. Because the University Writing Program cannot appoint tenure-track and adjunct faculty, the five tenure-track faculty and two adjunct faculty hold joint appointments in two departments: English and Communication. As a result of approval of UIDTP, the remaining already hold positions in the University Writing Program. All faculty members will have positions in the newly formed department, with two tenure-track faculty who wish to maintain relationships with their current departments, maintaining tenure in those departments and the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies. The departure of three faculty members from English to the new department will leave the English department with 30 faculty members, a number sufficient to offer their curriculum. Below a is table explaining the current and future configuration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>FUTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track Faculty: 5</td>
<td>4 English/UWP</td>
<td>3 Writing &amp; Rhetoric Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Communication/UWP</td>
<td>1 Writing &amp; Rhetoric Studies/Engl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Writing &amp; Rhetoric Studies/Comm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty: 2</td>
<td>2 Communication/UWP</td>
<td>2 Writing &amp; Rhetoric Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer Faculty: 8</td>
<td>8 UWP</td>
<td>8 Writing &amp; Rhetoric Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Instructors: 5</td>
<td>5 UWP</td>
<td>5 Writing &amp; Rhetoric Studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff
In order to advise students, an advisor trained by the Assistant Dean, Undergraduate Affairs in the College of Humanities will oversee administration of the major and minor. The advisor will be part of the advising team in the College of Humanities. Initially this position will be a reallocation of a staff member. Substantial growth of the major will necessitate an additional staff person for advising. The Dean of the College of Humanities has made a commitment to this staff position.
Library and Information Resources
Library resources are abundant. A review of the holdings in the J. Willard Marriot Library demonstrates that it has extensive holdings in Writing and Rhetoric Studies, including monographs, databases, and online journals specific to the discipline of Writing and Rhetoric Studies (see attached letters of support).

Admissions Requirements
Students must be in good standing at the University of Utah. They must also have completed WRTG 2010 or its equivalent with a grade of C- or better before being admitted into the major. While this may seem low, students who seek more knowledge of, and practice with writing are also suited for the major; with instruction, they are expected to improve.

Student Advising
The major will be housed in the University Writing Program, which will also provide advising to students through a trained staff advisor. The advisor will be part of the advising team in the College of Humanities.

Justification for Graduation Standards and Number of Credits
The major will consist of 33 credit hours, a typical concentration of hours for a degree in the College of Humanities. Similar majors at other institutions range from 27- 35 credit hours. Students will also be required to fulfill the University of Utah graduation requirements for a total of 126 credit hours. Students must receive a 2.75 GPA every year to be in good standing in the program.

External Review and Accreditation
The recommendation for the UWP to seek departmental status resulted from the most recent internal/external review (2003). At that time, members of the team reported that the UWP functioned as a department and therefore, recommended it transition into one. A Writing Board has been reinstated with members representing disciplines and Colleges. The Board is charged with advising on the direction of writing on campus, and curriculum innovation and development within the UWP. Finally, the major in Writing and Rhetoric Studies will be part of regular internal and external reviews for departments housed in the College of Humanities.

Projected Program Enrollment and Graduates; Projected Departmental Faculty/Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Category</th>
<th>Current – Prior to New Program Implementation</th>
<th>Projected Year 1</th>
<th>Projected Year 2</th>
<th>Projected Year 3</th>
<th>Projected Year 4</th>
<th>Projected Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Graduates in Proposed Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of Declared Majors in Proposed Program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section III: Need

Program Need
The field of rhetoric and composition has been gaining ground as an academic discipline since the early 1960s, with the first publication of several groundbreaking articles and books that applied consistent research methods to undergraduate writing. Over the last fifty years, the discipline has expended throughout the United States, generating extensive research on writing instruction and a number of print and online journals dedicated to publishing research on writing and rhetoric. Increasingly, institutions of higher learning are establishing majors and minors. Writing and Rhetoric Studies was officially acknowledged in 2010 by the National Research Council (NRC) and the degree also has its own identifying CIP code. This acknowledgement denotes that the discipline has shown itself to be sustainable based on the number of graduate students and research it produces annually (see Appendix G for a history of national positions in Writing and Rhetoric Studies).

The University Writing Program exemplifies these positive developments in the discipline, having a well-established doctoral program (through three departments) a major, a growing minor, and quality instruction at the lower and upper-division levels for general education and the baccalaureate requirement. Since its inception, the growth of the University Writing Program has been consistent and strong. (Refer to Appendix A for the development of the UWP.)

Labor Market Demand Bureau of Labor Statistics
The demand for quality writers in the workplace is high, as indicated above. The ability to write is one of the most critical skills in the workplace. According to The National Commission on Writing (2004), corporations spend billions of dollars each year to improve the writing skills of their employees. Students who major in Writing and Rhetoric Studies will be more aware of the rhetorical demands of written communication, better able to adapt their writing for different situations and audiences, and ultimately, able to efficiently write better, more effective texts.
short, they will have an advantage over others who do not have this background. Students with the degree will be prepared not only to be better writers in their own areas of expertise but will be better prepared for successful careers as writers and communications specialists in a range of fields: publishing, editing, professional writing, government, community advocacy, the non-profit sector, corporate communications, in scientific and technical fields, education, pre-law and medicine, as well as for graduate work in the field of Writing and Rhetoric Studies. Currently in the State of Utah, there are 1640 jobs that request expertise in writing. (For a list of entry level and local job opportunities in Writing and Rhetoric Studies nationally and locally, see Appendix H).

**Student Demand**

Writing and Rhetoric Studies majors are increasing nationally. Our major would place the University of Utah among other top institutions such as the University of Texas-Austin and the University of Minnesota, which now offer similar majors. However, our major is unique in that students can tailor their interest in studying writing with courses from other departments. The curriculum allows students to design their own degree, emphasizing the areas that are most relevant for their pursuits. Thus, students with different needs are able to pursue them through the configuration of the degree. This configuration also allows students to complete a double major, pairing a Writing and Rhetoric Studies degree with another bachelor degree. In recent years several students have pursued a degree in Writing and Rhetoric Studies through the Bachelor of University Studies Program (BUS). In 2007, the University graduated the first student with a BUS with such a degree. Currently 30 students have declared a minor in the area. (see attached letters of support).

In April 2013, a survey to determine the interest in a major in Writing and Rhetoric Studies was administered to undergraduates at the U of U who had taken a course in WRTG within the past year (2012-13). Results indicate that there is healthy interest in the major. Approximately 227 students responded: 51 freshman, 56 sophomore, 62 juniors and 46 seniors; twelve students did not list their level. The following Colleges were represented: DESB (13%), College of Engineering (12%), College of Fine Arts (8%) College of Humanities (20%), College of Science (25%), and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (23%).

Students indicated a strong interest in enrolling in courses offered through the major (79%), but as might be expected, freshmen and sophomores were generally more likely to be interested in a major in Writing and Rhetoric Studies. The tables below show student interest in the major according to year, and college.

**Interest According to Year in School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of Students &amp; Level of Interest on 5-pt. Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>24%/4.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>26%/4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>29%/4.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked if students would be interested in a major in Writing and Rhetoric Studies, 32% of students were interested to very interested in the major, with 9.00 % (20 students) responding they were very interested and 23% interested (50 students); twenty-one percent (46 students) were somewhat interested. Twenty-four percent of students (53 students) were less interested and 23% (50 students) were not interested. Students were more likely to be interested in the major as a second major, with 63% of respondents (138 students) indicating a strong interest in the degree as a second major. On a scale of 1-5, students overall interest in the major was 4.4 on a 5.0 scale.

Although students generally found the degree attractive as a first or second major, those in their first two years at the University, and in the Colleges of Engineering and Science, DESB, and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences responded more favorably. Students who would not consider the major, are either too far along to change their current major or add an additional major (29%), or are not interested in the field (39%). Twenty-four percent of students responded they are not planning on a degree in Writing and Rhetoric Studies. Finally, 9% responded that had they known about the degree, they would have considered it.

### Similar Programs

Approximately 65 institutions offer majors in Writing and Rhetoric Studies throughout the United States, although the one most similar to ours is the University of Texas-Austin. In the Intermountain West, Montana State University and University of Nevada, Reno offer a BA with an emphasis in Writing Studies. The curriculums at both Universities are rooted in the course offerings of the English Departments (Creative Writing, Literature, Technical Writing, Rhetoric), making them different and less flexible than the department and major proposed here. Other institutions with a BA in Writing and Rhetoric include Arizona State University at the Polytechnic; University of Arkansas; Clemson University; Eastern Michigan State University; University of Florida; Georgia State University; University of Illinois-Champaign/Urbana; James Madison University; Marquette University; MIT; University of Montana; University of Nevada-Reno; University of New Mexico; North Carolina State University; University of Pittsburgh; Purdue University; University of Rhode Island; and many others.
Island; University of South Carolina; Syracuse University; University of Texas-Austin; Utah State University; Washington State University.

Collaboration with and Impact on Other USHE Institutions
The new department would have no impact on other USHE institutions. Students enrolling in the new major would be students already enrolled at the University of Utah. In Utah, three institutions offer an emphasis in writing through the Department of English. Utah State and Weber State offer a major in Technical and Professional Writing and Utah Valley University offers a major in Writing Studies. These, too, are different from the proposed major in that in addition to the courses that comprise the major, students select core elective courses from creative writing or literature. The Writing Certificate at Salt Lake Community College offers courses at the lower-division, but does not provide a major (see attached letters of support).

The core of the major draws from Writing and Rhetoric Studies, with other core electives coming from relevant areas. Unlike other degrees in the state, the proposed major would enable students to apply their interest in Writing and Rhetoric Studies to a particular academic field (e.g., biology, business, design, psychology) or topical area (e.g., social justice, environmental studies, media studies).

Benefits
The new department will benefit the University of Utah and the Utah System of Higher Education by better serving students in Writing and Rhetoric Studies, as well as students in all disciplines who will undoubtedly employ writing in their professional lives. As the research demonstrates, clear and accurate writing is an integral component for success in the majority of positions. Students will be better prepared to meet the demands of the workplace and improve its productivity. Conjoining interests and expertise allows us to harness our knowledge in ways that improve our strengths and also highlight the stature of the College and University. The proposed department would be the first Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies among PAC 12 institutions.

Consistency with Institutional Mission
According to the University of Utah mission, the institution is charged with ensuring the highest quality standards to engage students in learning. It does so through providing students opportunities for inquiry, discovery, and a deep sense of responsibility and social commitment. A major in Writing and Rhetoric Studies is compatible with this mission in that it provides students the knowledge and skills to participate more fully in their professional, personal, and civic lives. Knowing how to write is integral to success in these various arenas. Students are able to address all three arenas through courses in the major.

The University of Utah highly values its students' ability to excel in their endeavors, whether they are academic, professional or civic. The knowledge and skills learned through Writing and Rhetoric Studies support this mission. Communicating through print and digital texts in a more interactive global world is imperative now, and will continue to grow in importance in the future. Increasingly with new technologies, writing will become even more demanding in terms of knowledge and skill. At a very basic level the degree offers students knowledge about genre, style, grammar and mechanics, uses of sources, and the ability to read one's own work for the purpose of quality and improvement. At a more advanced level, students learn about the history of writing and its influence in shaping workplace practices, and social issues and values. This includes learning
about the role of technologies in the development of writing, the development and growth of writing in various disciplines, writing for those in other cultures, the import of the visual into print, and so on. This knowledge supports students’ ability to better understand the dynamics and contingencies of writing, while helping them to produce successful, appropriate documents and texts.

Program and Student Assessment
The University Writing Program faculty will meet at the end of each spring semester to assess the success of the degree. Information will consist of student portfolios, student exit interview data, and aggregate student feedback from course evaluations. This information will provide formative assessment to determine if and how the degree should be improved to better meet student needs.

There are several means to evaluate the success of the degree. First, the students' programs of study will be assessed with the advisor to determine the quality and feasibility of the curriculum, given their goals. Second, students' ability will be measured by their successful completion of the core courses and their evaluative feedback of them. Exit interviews will be conducted on a regular basis with a randomly selected group of students as they complete the degree. Finally, in the fifth year, the University Writing Program will review how students with this major have fared. Assessment will be based on students' grade point average, record of successful acceptance into graduate programs, and record of job placement. Students must have a GPA of 2.75 annually.

Expected Standards of Student Performance
Students will be expected to have 1) examined the central tenets of rhetoric and writing through the two core courses and 2) increased their understanding of writing as a complex social act, and 3) increased their knowledge of different writing competencies and situations. Specific learning outcomes include:

1. **History and Theory.** Students will identify, understand and explain different historical rhetorical theories and practices.
2. **Social Practices.** Students will identify, understand and explain different contexts for writing (e.g., education, the workplace, and society).
3. **Multimodal Competency.** Students will compose using a variety of multimodal texts, combining print, visual, digital, and other modes of writing.
4. **Writing Competency.** Students will improve understanding of audiences, writing processes, genres, and grammatical structures that fulfill reader expectations.
5. **Information Literacy.** Students will demonstrate the ability to locate, evaluate, and appropriately use sources from a variety of media.

To assess students’ progress through the degree, a portfolio will be created as they enter the program, and reviewed annually. Individual performance and programmatic evaluation can be evaluated through this process.

Section V: Finance
The first three years, no new funds will be required as all courses are currently offered through the regular curriculum and no new courses will be added. After the third year, if enrollments substantially increase, additional staffing might be required.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departmental Data</th>
<th>Current Budget—Prior to New Program Implementation</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personnel Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>$219,925</td>
<td>$235,085</td>
<td>$237,208</td>
<td>$237,208</td>
<td>$237,208</td>
<td>$237,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>$70,376</td>
<td>$82,280</td>
<td>$83,023</td>
<td>$83,023</td>
<td>$83,023</td>
<td>$83,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personnel Expense</strong></td>
<td>$290,301</td>
<td>$317,365</td>
<td>$320,231</td>
<td>$320,231</td>
<td>$320,231</td>
<td>$320,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-personnel Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Non-personnel Expense</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expense</strong> (Personnel + Current)</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Departmental Funding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriated Fund</td>
<td>$290,301</td>
<td>$317,365</td>
<td>$320,231</td>
<td>$320,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Legislative Appropriation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Special Fees/Differential Tuition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Revenue</th>
<th>$290,301</th>
<th>$317,365</th>
<th>$320,231</th>
<th>$586,679</th>
<th>$320,231</th>
<th>$320,231</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue - Expense</td>
<td></td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$7,350</td>
<td>$13,650</td>
<td>$18,900</td>
<td>$23,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Instructional Cost/Student Credit Hour*</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$7,350</td>
<td>$13,650</td>
<td>$18,900</td>
<td>$23,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(as reported in institutional Cost Study for “current” and using the same Cost Study Definition for “projected”)*

*Projected Instructional Cost/Student Credit Hour* data contained in this chart are to be used in the Third-Year Follow-Up Report and Cyclical Reviews required by R411.

**Budget Comments**
Because the number of faculty and staff currently can sustain the major, no additional positions are foreseen. However, if the major grows substantially, additional positions will be required. Funds for those positions would come from growth in the degree.

**Funding Sources**
The degree will be funded primarily from the SCH model at the University of Utah. Consistent growth in the UWP over the last years has supported growth of the minor and will also support growth of the major.

**Reallocation**
Currently, all faculty members in the University Writing Program have a tenure home through either the Department of Communication (1) or through the Department of English (4). Three of the four tenure and tenure –track faculty members from English will move to the Department of Writing and Rhetoric. The SCH they generate will also move to the new department. While this is a loss to the Department of English, their current positions in English are funded 100% through the UWP. The two remaining tenured faculty will maintain their current position in English and Communication and also have a tenure line in the new department. The SCH generated from the courses they teach for English and Communication will go to those departments, and not the Department of Writing and Rhetoric.

**Impact on Existing Budgets**
There will be a slight impact on the department of English, as SCH generated from the courses taught by the three faculty members who will move to the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies will be allocated to the UWP. Each of these three faculty members teaches one course per year for the English Department, so the impact would impact the SCH for three courses with a grand total of approximately 75 students.
There are five-tenure-line faculty members, eight career-line positions of varying ranks, five associate instructors, and two adjunct faculty members (refer to biosketches in Appendix F).

All career-line and adjunct faculty, and associate instructors will remain and maintain their current status in the new department. Two of the tenure-line members, having long standing relationships in their home departments (English and Communication), will maintain their tenure lines in the home department and the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies. Three tenure-line members will be transitioned to the new department once the PhD program is moved over to it, and as the current students complete their graduate degrees through the home departments. In this way, they can continue to play critical roles as chair and inside members on the Writing and Rhetoric graduate degree committees. Tenure line hires in the future will then be solely in the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies.
## Appendix A:
### History of UWP Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Courses Offered</th>
<th>Initiatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1983-1990     | *WRTG 101: Intro*  
*WRTG 201: Intermediate*  
*WRTG 315: Technical & Professional*  
*WRTG 316: Business*       | UWP established as independent academic unit                                                                                              |
| 1990-2000     | *WRTG 3011: Arts & Humanities*  
*WRTG 3102: Social Sciences*  
*WRTG 3014: Sciences*  
*WRTG 6000: Publication*   | PhD program founded  
CLEAR foundation established in ME                                                                                                         |
| 2000-2005     | *WRTG 4080: Environmental*  
*WRTG 4200: Non-fiction*     | Writing Center established  
Minor in Literacy established  
CLEAR extended throughout College of Engineering: 5 graduate writing consultants                                                           |
| 2005-2013     | See list of courses for the minor  
*WRTG 7000: Dissertation*  
*WRTG 7001: Grant Writing*  
*WRTG 7060: Scientific Writing*  
*WRTG 7080: Health Sciences* | AMES: offer 3 sections each of WRTG 1010 and 2010 annually, 3 TA positions  
PhD Campaign: From 3 local (2005) to 17 national (2012-2013) students  
Writing Fellows to assist graduate students and faculty with articles & grant-writing.  
Lecturer Positions in UWP  
Minor Revised: Writing & Rhetoric Studies: 2 students before revision to 30 in 2013-14  
Glendale Dreamkeepers Literacy Center  
Majors: First major through BUS in 2008.  
Major in Writing & Rhetoric Studies Approved July, 2013: First year prediction for number of majors exceeded |
# Appendix B:
List of Writing and Rhetoric Studies Course Offerings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course ID</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1003</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Introduction to Writing at the University</td>
<td>Meets with ESL &amp; WRTG 6003. This course is intended to familiarize multilingual students with American university-level academic writing. Students will learn about relevant topics, including grammar and style, plagiarism, addressing instructors' feedback, and working effectively with American classmates in their courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>University Writing and Thinking</td>
<td>Students learn about the transition from high school to university-level writing and thinking. The course introduces students to university discourse conventions through the analyses and writing of academic texts. Students increase their awareness of and practice responding to a variety of academic situations through activities such as note-taking, library research, and critical evaluation. Students will also be introduced to the design and production of multimedia and print texts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Introduction to Academic Writing</td>
<td>Students learn to read and write rhetorically, develop and support claims, and produce and evaluate writing in collaboration with peers. Course readings and assignments emphasize writing for diverse purposes and disciplines. To be taken during Freshman year. Writing Requirement 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Intermediate Writing: Academic Writing and Research</td>
<td>Writing in undergraduate academic contexts. Students practice analytical and persuasive writing that addresses various academic audiences in a research university. Emphasis on writing for learning, textual analysis, writing from research, and collaborative writing. To be taken Freshman year. Writing Requirement 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2799</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Technologies of Business Writing</td>
<td>Focuses on the development of business writing as it relates to technology trends. The course traces the evolution of business writing from early accounting to Twitter and beyond. Readings cover the ways inscription has played a role in how business has been conducted, from images on clay pots to social networking. Course is suitable for business majors, minors, or those interested in a humanities approach to studying business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3005</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Workplace Writing</td>
<td>Focuses on the types of practical writing used in and for the workplace: email, memos, cover letters, short reports, and resumes. Emphasizes precision and professional presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3011</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Writing in the Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>Prepares students for professional and public careers in the Arts and Humanities by emphasizing reading and writing arguments and the kinds of writing needed in further study and executive positions: summaries, analyses, proposals, research notes, reports, and reviews. Includes collaborative projects, electronic writing, instruction in revision and editing, and exploratory writing to discover ideas. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Writing in the Social Sciences</td>
<td>Designed to facilitate thinking and writing in the social sciences. Focuses on using sources to develop critical thinking on issues, forming one's own position about disciplinary problems, and creating arguments using rhetorical conventions associated with specific disciplines. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRN</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3014</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Writing in the Sciences</td>
<td>Designed to help students in the sciences develop the skills needed for scientific research and communication. Provides students with the opportunity to write in the variety of forms that they are likely to encounter in their professional lives (i.e. memos, proposals, reports, presentations) in a scientific context. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3015</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Professional/Technical Writing</td>
<td>Prepares students for professional practice by emphasizing problem solving in organizational contexts, writing for multiple audiences, and writing with visual and numerical data. Includes collaborative projects. Service learning option. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3016</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Business Writing</td>
<td>Focuses on strategies for communicating successfully with business audiences. Students employ composition technologies to prepare different types of workplace texts, including emails, memos, proposals, reports, resumes and presentations. Emphasis on critical thinking and problem solving in a business context. WRTG 2010 or its equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3018</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Writing Popular Culture</td>
<td>This is a writing course that works through the lens of film, music, television, and new media to explore the cultural contexts of post-modern culture. A key component is learning to write detailed analyses of these kinds of texts, as well as understanding the function such texts play in our collective cultural memory. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3019</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Writing about War</td>
<td>Designed to help students develop and refine their reading, writing, and communication skills by examining and articulating their perspectives of war. Students will study the work of established authors and write multiple genres, including nonfiction, fiction, and analysis. Open to all students, but men and women in uniform and veterans are encouraged to enroll. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3040</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Digital Storytelling</td>
<td>Digital storytelling takes new tools and techniques—computers and software—to update the ancient craft of telling tales. Students apply their writing abilities along with digital imaging and editing tools to tell a series of illustrated stories using pictures and narration in ways that are engaging and exciting. The class will focus on the telling of real-life stories. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3430</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Language of the Law</td>
<td>This course is about the specialized, sometimes arcane, always powerful language in which Anglo-American law is written and through which it is enacted. Though we will focus on US Law, we will do so within the broader context of English Common Law, learning. We will learn about the Anglo-Saxon and Latin roots of legal English. We will also consider the role written language plays in transmitting law from generation to generation in the form of statutes, precedents, and case law, and we will consider the role of spoken language in in-court interactions. To delve into the finer points of these topics, we will learn about legal argumentation, read about legal realism v. legal positivism, and consider questions of linguistic ambiguity. Readings will consist of pleadings, briefs, statute, code, judicial opinions, and trial transcripts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3440</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Digital Research Methods</td>
<td>This course is an interdisciplinary study in online and networked research methodology. Prepares students to develop efficient, effective, and ethical research methods for online environments through qualitative and quantitative activities including: website analysis, link traces, data collection, information visualization, interviews, collaboration, search engine optimization, data coding, and social network analysis. Course topics will vary to account for emerging research technologies and instructor/student interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3510</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grammar and Stylistics for Academic Writing</td>
<td>Examines common grammatical and stylistic problems from a rhetorical and functional perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3610</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>Formally approved internship in a writing field. May be taken two times for a total of 6 credits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3705</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rhetoric, Science &amp; Technology Studies</td>
<td>This course examines how science/technology has transformed since its foothold as a social institution during the Scientific Revolution to its contemporary merging with corporate entities. Students explore the role of scientific writing as a catalyst for social change, examining issues related to such concepts as secularism, consumerism and globalization. Students also explore the ways in which scientific writing influences science/technology, examining issues related to the production of writing for funding, research and development, and implementation. This course furthers understanding of the relationship among writing, science and society. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3810</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>From Cuneiform to Computing</td>
<td>This course examines histories of writing technologies. Readings and assignments will ask students to research and analyze a variety of material, cultural, and social conditions in which individual technologies develop. Courses may be taught as a broad historical survey or may focus on particular technologies or writing. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3830</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Research in Professional Communication</td>
<td>This course introduces students to the traditions of professional and technical writing. It examines the historical background upon which the field is based, as well as the contemporary research that transforms its practices. It also explores important contemporary issues related to professional communication, from issues of gender to issues of changes in workplace environments. serves as a gateway course for those interested in working in professional and technical writing. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3860</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Introduction to Rhetoric</td>
<td>A survey of select rhetorical theories and examples of rhetoric from Greek antiquity to the present. Emphasizes connections between rhetoric and writing. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3870</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Writing as Social Practice</td>
<td>In this course, students will be introduced to key theories of writing. Emphasis will be placed on the cultural, social, and rhetorical practices that have given rise to and shape writing processes, documents, and ultimately writers themselves. Students will be introduced to various forms of writing, theories that consider the impact of material and social factors, such as education, on writing systems, and theories that consider the writer/reader relationship that is established through writing. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3890</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Under-Represented Rhetorics</td>
<td>The course examines the discourses of power systems within the United States, considering the ways writing serves as a medium of control over national ideas and group identities. Simultaneously, the course explores rhetoric representative of several national histories, heritages, and social movements. The course focuses on theories or rhetoric and discourse, writing to establish the &quot;other,&quot; writing and the construction of race, rhetorical concepts of gender and class, and tools for analyzing power discourses. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Advanced Literacy Studies</td>
<td>Meets with ENGL 3690. This course concerns theories and practices of literacy. Students read about and respond to a popular current theory of literacy then take up case studies of literacy practices. They also examine their own literacy practices as students and as members of other communities. Service Learning Option. Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Writing for Scholarly Publication</td>
<td>Preparation of various styles of academic and professional writing, including abstracts, undergraduate honors theses, and journal articles. This course will provide undergraduate students a background in scholarly research and publishing in various disciplines. Students in this course will analyze how academic communities construct, communicate, and preserve knowledge. Upon completion of this course, students will have the basic tools for publishing a journal article or an undergraduate thesis. A unique feature of this course is that students will not only study the craft of creating an article, but will develop sound and efficient research strategies that they can apply in graduate and professional schools. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4001</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Business Plans &amp; Proposals</td>
<td>Prepares students for writing in the business world. Focuses on business plan and proposal writing in a business context, addressing the expectations of specific audiences. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Writing Across Borders</td>
<td>Prepares student to write for culturally and linguistically diverse audiences for various purposes. Emphasizes linguistic and rhetorical considerations in print and electronic texts. Focus on critical appreciation of English as an international language. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4020</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Writing Center Colloquium</td>
<td>Theory and practice of responding to undergraduate writing, including comment and evaluation. Conducted in a workshop setting and applicable to all disciplines. Of special interest to those who are interested in becoming tutors of writing. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4030</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Visual Rhetoric: Word/Image/Argument</td>
<td>Students will learn theories of visual rhetorical criticism, and examine different strategies for integrating words and images, and other multimedia elements. They learn to employ principles of effective document design and visual argument, as well as practice strategies for design and composition of new media texts. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4040</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Digital Rhetoric</td>
<td>Meets with WRTG 6040. The course explores the ways that online, mobile, and networked technologies shape rhetorical theory and practice. Coursework will include projects that analyze and compose with digital media. Topics may vary to account for emerging technologies and communication practices. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4050</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Writing &amp; Cultural Rhetorics</td>
<td>This course explores how cultures and people outside the &quot;mainstream&quot; of Greco-Roman-western rhetoric use language and other symbol systems for constitutive and suasive purposes. Specifically, it examines how diverse groups in the US develop rhetoric to identify themselves as members of groups and then enact political and social change. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4070</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rhetorics of Gender</td>
<td>This course is designed to give students an introduction to gender research that is distinctly rhetorical. Students will use theories from contemporary and classical rhetoric and criticism to interrogate the construction and performance of gender in a variety of social settings and media, the gendering of the writing studies/writing instruction, and the gendering of the tradition of rhetoric itself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4080</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-Fiction Environmental</td>
<td>Meets with WRTG 6080. Engages students to write about contemporary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>environmental problems from a variety of genres.</td>
<td>In particular, creative/ecocritical, natural history/science, and public/advocacy writing are emphasized. Students will learn to think critically and with nuance about environmental issues and convey that information in its complexity. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4090</td>
<td>3 Materiality of the Book</td>
<td>Meets with WRTG 6090. Through Medieval and early-American marginalia, the advent of the printing press, and the avant-garde's use of typography, this course studies the book as material object and fulcrum in cultural movements. The course examines theories of the book next to brief lessons on letterpress printing and bookbinding. Open to students of all ranges of experience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4200</td>
<td>3 Writing Popular Nonfiction</td>
<td>Focuses on popular nonfiction addressed to a wider audience. Students practice a select set of genres such as travel, memoir, autobiography, biography, history, food, domestics, science, technology, personal philosophy and religion. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4830</td>
<td>3 Document Design and Usability</td>
<td>Document Design and Usability focuses on professional writing and publication of both print based and electronic documents. Through a variety of projects, it covers advanced theories of document design, web-based publishing, educational media, information delivery, and multimedia production. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4870</td>
<td>3 Introduction to Composition Studies</td>
<td>This course introduces students to the present state of scholarly debate about rhetoric and composition and the forces that have shaped the field. Students examine research contributions in the multidisciplinary array in which rhetoric is situated, across composition, English, communication studies, philosophy, writing and discourse studies. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4890</td>
<td>3 Writing, Persuasion &amp; Power</td>
<td>This course addresses writing as a medium of control over ideas, individuals, and/or groups. Course content may include theories of writing, rhetoric, and discourse; writing and ethnicities; writing and gender; and tools for analyzing power discourses. Objects of study may include academic and professional disciplines, advertising, legislation, media and news coverage, propaganda, and social justice, among other topics. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4903</td>
<td>3 Language of the Law</td>
<td>This course is about the specialized, sometimes arcane, always powerful language in which Anglo-American law is written and through which it is enacted. Though we will focus on US Law, we will do so within the broader context of English Common Law, learning. We will learn about the Anglo-Saxon and Latin roots of legal English. We will also consider the role written language plays in transmitting law from generation to generation in the form of statutes, precedents, and case law, and we will consider the role of spoken language in in-court interactions. To delve into the finer points of these topics, we will learn about legal argumentation, read about legal realism v. legal positivism, and consider questions of linguistic ambiguity. Readings will consist of pleadings, briefs, statues, code, judicial opinions, and trial transcripts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4905</td>
<td>3 Studies in Professional Discourses: Discourses of Medicine</td>
<td>This course introduces students to professional discourse, such as legal, medical, governmental, media, or non-profit. Course content may include discourses of legislation, sustainability, risk assessment, world health organizations, legal precedent, and the like. Using a variety of theories and methods for gathering and analyzing professional discourses, students will consider the ways in which professional discourses intersect with larger discourses of power and ideology.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4910</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Independent Readings in Rhetoric, Discourse, and Writing</td>
<td>Group and independent readings on a topic supplementary to student's area of study. Not equivalent to major or minor required courses. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4990</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Undergraduate Research</td>
<td>Topics vary according to scholarly interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medical &amp; Health Sciences Discourses</td>
<td>Meets with WRTG 6010. Students examine documents including patient histories, clinical research reports, journal articles, personal narratives of patients and providers, online professional literature, and health-care videos, which they analyze in terms of rhetorical and larger discourses of power and ideology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5770</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Research in Writing &amp; Rhetoric</td>
<td>A survey of the various methodologies used in rhetoric and writing studies. Critical reading and examination of different methodological approaches, with attention to their assumptions, strengths and weaknesses. Also provides a foundation for research design; appropriate questions, processes, analyses, and interpretive strategies for the various approaches. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5830</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Digital Publishing &amp; Editing</td>
<td>This course helps to strengthen basic technical writing skills through increasing awareness of how language, visual design and illustrations work. Students learn to analyze and critique technical documents to improve their communicative functions. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5900</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Literacy Studies: Reading, Writing, Identity &amp; Class</td>
<td>Meets with WRTG 3900 and ENGL 3690. History and theory of literacy, including scholarship on literacy and schooling, intercultural communication, and literacy in the workplace. Service learning option. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5905</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Special Topics in Rhetoric &amp; Writing Studies</td>
<td>Topical thematic courses. Variable content. Students strongly advised to take WRTG 2010 or equivalent prior to this course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5999</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Research-Independent Study</td>
<td>For students engaged in faculty-supervised research. May be taken 2 times for credit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C:
Major in Writing and Rhetoric Studies
Program Curriculum: 33 Credit Hours

Students are **REQUIRED** to meet with their advisor before signing up for courses.

I. Required Courses (6 credits hours)
WRTG 3860: Introduction to Rhetoric (HF)
WRTG 3870: Writing as Social Practice (HF)

II. Rhetoric and Writing Studies (15 credit hours)
Select 5 courses (see attached list for course clusters students with similar interests select)

WRTG 2799: Technologies of Business Writing
WRTG 3018: Writing about Popular (HF)
WRTG 3019: Writing about War (HF)
WRTG 3040: Digital Storytelling
WRTG 3430: Language of the Law
WRTG 3440: Digital Research Methods
WRTG/Linguistics 3510: Grammar and Stylistics
WRTG 3600: Grammar for Writing
WRTG 3705: Rhetoric, Science and Technology Studies (BF; HF)
WRTG 3810: From Cuneiform to Computing
WRTG 3830: Research in Professional Communication
WRTG 3840: Writing and the Public Sphere
WRTG 3890: Under-Represented Rhetorics (DV)
WRTG 3900/ENGLISH 3690: Advanced Literacy Studies
WRTG 4000: Writing for Scholarly Publication
WRTG 4001: Business Plans and Proposals
WRTG 4010: Writing Across Borders (IR)
WRTG 4020: Writing Center Colloquium: Theory and Practice
WRTG 4030: Visual Rhetoric: Word/Image/Argument (CW; QB)
WRTG 4040: Digital Rhetoric
WRTG 4050: Cultural Rhetorics
WRTG 4070: Rhetorics of Gender
WRTG 4080: Writing Environmental Nonfiction (CW)
WRTG 4090: Materiality of the Book
WRTG 4200: Writing Popular Non Fiction (CW)
WRTG 4830: Document Design & Usability (CW)
WRTG 4870: Introduction to Composition Studies
WRTG 4890: Writing, Persuasion, and Power
WRTG 4905: Studies in Professional Discourse (Law, Medicine, etc.)
WRTG 4910: Independent Readings in Rhetoric, Discourse, and Writing
WRTG 5110: Medical and Health Science Discourses
WRTG 5770: Research in Rhetoric and Writing
WRTG 5830: Digital Publishing
WRTG 5905: Special Topics in Rhetoric & Writing Studies
ENGL: 5970: Discourse Analysis

III. Academic and Professional Writing (3 credit hours)
Select 1 course (3 credit hours)
WRTG 3005: Workplace Writing
WRTG 3011: Writing in the Arts & Humanities (CW)
WRTG 3012: Writing in the Social Sciences (CW)
WRTG 3014: Writing in the Sciences (CW)
WRTG 3015: Professional and Technical Writing (CW)
WRTG 3016: Business Writing (CW)

IV. Topical Course Electives (9 credit hours)
Select 3 courses in consultation with your advisor. The courses can be from within the Writing Program or from other departments:

1. ________________ 2. ________________ 3. ________________
## Suggested Course Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fall Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Freshman Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sophomore Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Year, Fall Semester</td>
<td><strong>WRTG 3860: Intro to Rhetoric (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>WRTG 3870: Wrtg Social Practice (3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1 topical elective (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 topical elective (3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sophomore Year, Fall Semester</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>WRTG 3870: Wrtg Social Practice (3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Year, Spring Semester</td>
<td><strong>1 topical elective (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 topical elective (3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1 topical elective (3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 topical elective (3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior Year, Fall Semester</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2 WRTG electives (6)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior Year, Spring Semester</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 WRTG electives (6)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 topical elective (3)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Year, Fall Semester</strong></td>
<td><strong>2 WRTG Electives (6)</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 WRTG Elective (3)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples of Student Curricula

**Student w/ Biology/Pre-Med Interest**

I. Required Courses (6 credits hours)
   - WRTG 3860: Introduction to Rhetoric (HF)
   - WRTG 3870: Writing as Social Practice (HF)

II. Rhetoric and Writing Studies (15 credit hours)
   - WRTG 3705: Rhetoric, Science and Technology Studies (BF; HF)
   - WRTG 4010: Writing Across Borders (IR)
   - WRTG 4030: Visual Rhetoric: Word/Image/Argument (CW; QB)
   - WRTG 4040: Digital Rhetoric
   - WRTG 5110: Medical and Health Science Discourses

III. Academic and Professional Writing (3 credit hours)
   - WRTG 3014: Writing in the Sciences (CW)

IV. Topical Course Electives (9 credit hours)
   1) Biol 1030: Human Biology
   2) Anthro 4192: Medical Anthropology
   3) Comm 5116: Health Communication & Culture

**Student w/ Business Interest**

I. Required Courses (6 credits hours)
   - WRTG 3860: Introduction to Rhetoric (HF)
   - WRTG 3870: Writing as Social Practice (HF)

II. Rhetoric and Writing Studies (15 credit hours)
   - WRTG 2799: Technologies of Business Writing (HF)
   - WRTG/Linguistics 3510: Grammar and Stylistics (CW)
   - WRTG 3890: Under-Represented Rhetorics (DV)
   - WRTG 4010: Writing Across Borders (IR)
   - WRTG 4030: Visual Rhetoric: Word/Image/Argument (CW; QB)

III. Academic and Professional Writing (3 credit hours)
   - WRTG 3016: Business Writing (CW)

IV. Academic Interest (9 credit hours)
   1) BUS 1050: Foundations of Business Thought
   2) COMM 3170: Introduction to Org Comm
   3) WRTG 4001: Business Plans and Proposals

**Student w/ Gender Interest**

I. Required Courses (6 credits hours)
   - WRTG 3860: Introduction to Rhetoric (HF)
   - WRTG 3870: Writing as Social Practice (HF)

II. Rhetoric and Writing Studies (15 credit hours)
   - WRTG 3040: Digital Storytelling
   - WRTG/Linguistics 3510: Grammar and Stylistics (CW)
   - WRTG 3890: Under –Represented Rhetorics (DV)
   - WRTG 4030: Visual Rhetoric: Word/Image/Argument (CW; QB)
   - WRTG 4070: Rhetorics of Gender

III. Academic and Professional Writing (3 credit hours)
   - WRTG 3012: Writing in the Social Sciences

IV. Topical Courses (9 credit hours)
   1) ECON 1060: Pol Econ of Race, Ethnicity, Class & Gender
   2) Gender 2100: Introduction to Gender Studies
   3) PSYCH 3040: Psychology of Gender
Student w/International Interest
I. Required Courses (6 credits hours)
WRTG 3860: Introduction to Rhetoric (HF)
WRTG 3870: Writing as Social Practice (HF)

II. Rhetoric and Writing Studies (15 credit hours)
WRTG/Linguistics 3510: Grammar and Stylistics (CW)
WRTG 3890: Under-Represented Rhetorics (DV)
WRTG 4010: Writing Across Borders (IR)
WRTG 4030: Visual Rhetoric: Word/Image/Argument (CW; QB)
WRTG 4040: Digital Rhetoric

III. Academic and Professional Writing (3 credit hours)
WRTG 3005: Workplace Writing

IV. Academic Interest (9 credit hours)
1) HIST 1510: World History  2) POLI SCI: 2200 Intro to Comparative Politics  3) LING: 3470: Languages & Culture

Student w/ Pre-Law Interest
I. Required Courses (6 credits hours)
WRTG 3860: Introduction to Rhetoric (HF)
WRTG 3870: Writing as Social Practice (HF)

II. Rhetoric and Writing Studies (15 credit hours)
WRTG 3430: Language of the Law
WRTG 3510/Linguistics 3510 Grammar & Stylistics (CW)
WRTG 3890: Under-Represented Rhetorics (DV)
WRTG 4030: Visual Rhetoric: Word/Image/Argument (CW; QB)
WRTG 4905: Professional Discourses: Discourses of the Law

III. Academic and Professional Writing (3 credit hours)
WRTG 3005: Workplace Writing

IV. Topical Courses (9 credit hours)
1) LEAP 1150: The Role of Law in Society  2) HIST 3750: Recent America  3) POLI SCI 3200: Intro to Law & Politics

Student w/Professional Writing Interest
I. Required Courses (6 credits hours)
WRTG 3860: Introduction to Rhetoric (HF)
WRTG 3870: Writing as Social Practice (HF)

II. Rhetoric and Writing Studies (15 credit hours)
WRTG 3440: Digital Research Methods
WRTG 4030: Visual Rhetoric: Word/Image/Argument (CW; QB)
WRTG 4040: Digital Rhetorics
WRTG 4830: Document Design & Usability (CW)
WRTG 5830: Digital Publishing

III. Academic and Professional Writing (3 credit hours)
WRTG 4000: Writing for Scholarly Publication

IV. Topical Courses (9 credit hours)
1. FILM 2700: Intro to Videogames & Virtual Worlds
2. WRTG 3040: Digital Storytelling
3. COMM 3510: Intro to Web Design

Student w/General Rhetoric & Writing Interest
I. Required Courses (6 credits hours)
WRTG 3860: Introduction to Rhetoric (HF)
WRTG 3870: Writing as Social Practice (HF)

II. Rhetoric and Writing Studies (15 credit hours)
WRTG 3040: Digital Storytelling
WRTG 3510: Grammar & Stylistics (CW)
WRTG 4030: Visual Rhetoric: Word/Image/Argument (CW; QB)
WRTG 4090: Materiality of the Book
WRTG 4890: Writing, Persuasion & Power

III. Academic and Professional Writing (3 credit hours)
WRTG 3011: Writing in the Arts & Humanities (CW)

IV. Topical Courses (9 credit hours)
1. WRTG 3810: From Cuneiform to Computing
2. WRTG 4870: Intro to Composition Studies
3. ENG 5970: Discourse Analysis
Appendix D: Report on Writing

Description
A survey of 120 major American corporations employing nearly 8 million people concludes that in today’s workplace writing is a “threshold skill” for hiring and promotion among salaried (i.e., professional) employees. Survey results indicate that writing is a ticket to professional opportunity, while poorly written job applications are a figurative kiss of death. Estimates based on the survey returns reveal that employers spend billions annually correcting writing deficiencies. The survey, mailed to 120 human resource directors in corporations associated with Business Roundtable, produced responses from 64 companies, a 53.3 percent response rate.

Some of the Findings
• Writing is a “threshold skill” for both employment and promotion, particularly for salaried employees. Half the responding companies report that they take writing into consideration when hiring professional employees. “In most cases, writing ability could be your ticket in . . . or it could be your ticket out,” said one respondent.

• People who cannot write and communicate clearly will not be hired and are unlikely to last long enough to be considered for promotion. “Poorly written application materials would be extremely prejudicial,” said one respondent. “Such applicants would not be considered for any position.”

• Two-thirds of salaried employees in large American companies have some writing responsibility. “All employees must have writing ability . . . Manufacturing documentation, operating procedures, reporting problems, lab safety, waste-disposal operations—all have to be crystal clear,” said one human resource director.

• Eighty percent or more of the companies in the service and finance, insurance, and real estate (FIRE) sectors, the corporations with the greatest employment growth potential, assess writing during hiring. “Applicants who provide poorly written letters wouldn’t likely get an interview,” commented one insurance executive.

• A similar dynamic is at work during promotions. Half of all companies take writing into account when making promotion decisions. One succinct comment: “You can’t move up without writing skills.”

• More than half of all responding companies report that they “frequently” or “almost always” produce technical reports (59 percent), formal reports (62 percent), and memos and correspondence (70 percent). Communication through e-mail and PowerPoint presentations is almost universal. “Because of e-mail, more employees have to write more often. Also, a lot more has to be documented,” said one respondent.

• More than 40 percent of responding firms offer or require training for salaried employees with writing deficiencies. Based on the survey responses, it appears that remedying deficiencies in writing may cost American firms as much as $3.1 billion annually. “We’re likely to send out 200–300 people annually for skills-upgrade courses like ‘business writing’ or ‘technical writing,’” said one respondent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Department Status</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th># of Majors First Year</th>
<th># of Majors Today</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Arkansas, Little Rock</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Central Arkansas</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87 within five years</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Florida University</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Minor: 150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coe College</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colgate University</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Minor: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Paul University</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Southern University</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Valley University</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>Minor: 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca College</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>Minor: 70-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison University</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Minor: 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola University, Maryland</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Minor: 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40 within five years</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland University</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oberlin College</td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rhode Island</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Minor: 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowan University</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Minor: 424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Minor: 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of San</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>In process</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Texas-Austin</strong></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix F:  
Faculty Biosketches  

Jennifer Andrus (PhD, Rhetoric, Carnegie Mellon University) is Assistant Professor of English and the University Writing Program where she teaches courses on discourse analysis, law and language, rhetoric theory, gender, and literacy studies. She also coordinates the ENGL 1010 program. Her current research is on domestic violence and the Anglo-American law of evidence and the ways in which metadiscourses and text production constrain discursive agency. She has publications in *Technical Communication Quarterly, Discourse and Society, and Language in Society,* and is finishing a book manuscript titled Reliable Speech, Unreliable Speakers for Oxford University Press's Law and Language series.

Casey Boyle (PhD, English, University of South Carolina) is Assistant Professor of English and the University Writing Program. He teaches courses in composition theory & pedagogy, digital rhetoric, histories of rhetoric, and network culture. He is the Associate Editor for *Enculturation: a journal for rhetoric, writing, and culture.* Dr. Boyle’s research explores material rhetoric, media ecology, and composition theory. He is currently finishing *The Composition of Things: Rhetoric, Attunement, and the Practice of Abundance,* a book manuscript on the role of material practice in composition theory and rhetorical history. In addition to that project, Dr Boyle is co-editing an essay collection, *Rhetorical Ontologies: Rhetoric Through Everyday Things,* and is also creating a digital edition for Quintilian’s *Institutio Oratoria,* that seeks to combine primary text, secondary text, and tertiary commentary into one digital application interface.

Nona Brown (MA, English/Cultural Studies, Kansas State University) is an Instructor Lecturer in the University Writing Program. Her academic and teaching interests include composition theory and pedagogy, women and gender studies, French Feminist theory, mass media/popular culture, visual rhetorics, and graphical information design. Courses Nona has taught include Writing and Popular Culture, Visual Rhetoric and Writing in the Social Sciences.

Zacchariah Chatterley (MA, English/RhetComp, University of Utah) is an Instructor Lecturer in the University Writing Program. He has taught Introductory Writing, Intermediate Writing, Writing in the Humanities, and Scientific Writing. He also helped to develop the course, Writing in the Humanities. He is involved in a summer preparation course for incoming scholarship athletes, where he teaches a course on adapting to university writing. Currently, Mr. Chatterley oversees the placement essay program at the University of Utah. He has written numerous sentence structure primers for use by other teachers, and he is presently preparing an article on the rhetorical structure of medical reports.

Gregory Clark (PhD, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute) is Professor of English at Brigham Young University and Adjunct Professor in the University Writing Program. Professor Clark teaches a variety of courses in rhetorical theory and criticism at BYU and, occasionally, at the University of Utah. He is associate dean in the College of Humanities at BYU and executive director of the Rhetoric Society of America. His work explores intersections of the aesthetic and rhetorical, using theoretical tools offered in the work of Kenneth Burke.
Maureen Clark (MFA, University of Utah) is an Instructor Lecturer and director of the University Writing Center. She brings twenty years of writing and editing experience to undergraduate and graduate students seeking help in the writing center. She also works as an editor for university faculty members writing grants, articles for publication and research proposals. She has been teaching writing at the University of Utah for a total of eleven years. She is a past president of Writers @ Work, a nationally renowned writing conference and an editor with Dawn Marano & Associates, a developmental consultation firm. Her own poetry has appeared in the Bellingham Review, Colorado Review, Alaska Quarterly Review, Southeast Review, Gettysburg Review and Lumina, among others. She is interested in writing as a creative process in all academic disciplines. Her memoir, Falling into Bountiful, is currently being considered for publication, as well as her poetry manuscript, The Body Open.

David Hawkins (Ph.D. English, University of Utah) is Assistant Professor/Lecturer in Utah’s University Writing Program. He teaches graduate and undergraduate writing workshops (including Writing for Publication, Writing the Dissertation). He also has taught courses in Meso-American and Mexican Literature, professional communication and composition, and is currently planning a course in Body Rhetorics for next spring ('14). He has participated in a number of pedagogy panels at professional conferences, including the Association of Writers & Writing Programs (AWP ’02, ’05, ’11), the Joyce Centenary Symposium (’04), Writers at Work (’05), and most recently, College Composition and Communication (CCCC, ’13) where he presented on the need for a more conspicuous presence for writing in graduate instruction. Additional research interests include visual rhetoric, technologies in the classroom (especially social media), creative writing practices in rhetoric instruction, and Postcolonial/Lit Theory. In 2010 he was recognized with an Excellence in Teaching award from the University of Utah’s UWP.

Heather Hirschi (MFA, University of Utah) is Assistant Professor/Lecturer in the University of Utah Writing Program. Heather holds a Masters of Fine Arts in Creative Writing with an emphasis on Fiction and Bachelors degrees in English and Gender Studies. She has taught in various capacities for the University of Utah since 1994. Heather received the UWP’s Excellence in Writing Award for Teaching in 2009-2010 and again in 2011-2012. Heather teaches basic and intermediate composition and argumentation and writing in the Social Sciences. Her research and teaching interests include social justice rhetoric, digital media, and community-engaged education. She is particularly interested in the role mentoring can play in encouraging students of underrepresented populations to go to college. She has served as interim faculty director for Mestizo Arts and Activism, a mentoring program for high school students and in 2010, initiated the Dreamkeepers Project. Dreamkeepers is a community-engaged research project that seeks to understand and implement best practices for ensuring that underrepresented and at-risk middle school students thrive through high school and into college.

Thomas N. Huckin (PhD Linguistics, University of Washington) is Professor of English and Writing and Adjunct Professor of Linguistics. Previously he taught at the University of Michigan and Carnegie Mellon University. He teaches courses in discourse analysis, advanced research writing, and contemporary propaganda, and oversees the technical writing curriculum. As Director of the University Writing Program during the 1990s he was instrumental in founding the University’s PhD program in Rhetoric and Composition. His publications include Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary Communication, The New Century Handbook, Technical Writing and Professional Communication, Second Language Reading and Vocabulary Learning, and some fifty articles and chapters in
scholarly journals such as *College Composition and Communication*, *Journal of Advanced Composition*, *Written Communication*, *Linguistic Analysis*, *Visible Language*, and *Research in the Teaching of English*. He has served on the editorial boards of six international academic journals, including the *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, *English for Specific Purposes*, and *TESOL Quarterly*. He was a Senior Fulbright Lecturer in Brazil and has been a plenary speaker at academic conferences on all five continents.

**Cecil Jay Jordan** (PhD, English, The Pennsylvania State University) is Assistant Professor in the Department of English and University Writing Program, where he coordinates the required lower-division writing course and advises undergraduate students in the Minor in Writing and Rhetoric Studies. His research focuses on composition in multilingual settings with a particular emphasis on second language writing in US colleges and universities. He is author of *Redesigning Composition for Multilingual Realities* (NCTE, 2012) and co-editor of two collections on second language writing. His work has also appeared in *Across the Disciplines, College Composition and Communication, College English*, and *Rhetoric Review*.

**Paul Ketzle** (PhD, English, University of Utah) is an Instructor Lecturer in the University Writing Program. His research interests include Narrative Theory and Rhetoric, Visual Rhetoric, Creative Writing, and Creative Writing Pedagogy. For the University Writing Program he teaches cross-disciplinary graduate courses, such as Writing for Publication, as well as Non-Fiction, techniques and composition classes. His current research involves the relationship between logical argument and narrative as complementary and competitive rhetorical devises. His reviews have appeared in *Pedagogy*, and his short fiction has appeared in *Indiana Review*. His nonfiction has appeared in *Continuum, Utah Business* magazine, and elsewhere. His novel *Hero* won the Utah Original Writing Competition and is a finalist in the Great Novel Competition from Columbus Press. His story "Prairie Dogs" was a Finalist for the *GlimmerTrain* Family Matters contest. He previously served as editor of *Quarterly West* magazine and managing editor of *Western Humanities Review*.

**Maureen Mathison** (PhD, Rhetoric, Carnegie Mellon University) is Associate Professor of Communication and Writing. Previously she taught at The Ohio State University and Fairfield University. Prior to coming to the University of Utah, she was awarded the Charles Phelps Taft Postdoctoral Fellowship at the University of Cincinnati. Her research interests include examining disciplinary rhetoric; exploring the teaching and learning of literate practices across various disciplines; interdisciplinarity; and rhetoric and gender. She has published in *Communication Theory*, the *Journal of Business and Technical Communication*, the *Journal of Literacy, Written Communication*, and in numerous edited volumes. She is currently editing a volume on interdisciplinary teaching, *Sojourners and Third Cultures: A Case Study of Writing in the Disciplines, Teaching in the Disciplines*. Her grants include a $1.12M William and Flora Hewlett Foundation Grant, which established the CLEAR Program in the College of Engineering. She also collaborated with AMES, a Gates Foundation College Ready Charter High School, to establish a college writing curriculum. The initiative was part of an annual $25,000 Kellogg Literacy Grant to AMES for three years. Dr. Mathison is currently the Director of the University Writing Program.

**Joel Mullen** (PhD, Communication, University of Utah) is Instructor Lecturer for the University Writing Program. He has taught a variety of courses, including business writing and science writing. He is a member of the placement essay committee at the University of Utah. His research interests include cultural anthropology and Latin America. Besides his teaching experience, Joel’s
professional experience includes work as a journalist, and a decade working in rural development, including work for the US State Department, the Peace Corps and International Volunteer Services.

Alison E. Regan (PhD, English, University of Texas-Austin and MLS, University of Maryland) is Associate Librarian and Adjunct Associate Professor of Composition/UWP. Previously she taught in the English departments at the University of Hawaii and the University of Texas. She teaches courses in writing for publication, digital storytelling and methods of scholarly and archival library research. As Head of Scholarship and Education Services at the J. Willard Marriott Library, she oversees the Digital Scholarship Lab and the library’s teaching efforts as well as Dissertation Boot Camps, and she serves as liaison to Gender Studies and the Honors Program. Her publications include Writing in an Electronic World and articles in various English Studies and Library Science Journals. She has won awards for teaching and for service learning/community engaged teaching.

Natalie Stillman-Webb (PhD, English, Purdue University) is Associate Professor/Lecturer in the University Writing Program. She teaches courses in visual rhetoric, usability testing, and scientific, technical and business writing. In 2012 she was awarded the University of Utah’s Early Career Teaching Award, and she has obtained three Teaching & Learning Technologies Course Development Grants to design online writing courses. Her research interests include writing in the disciplines, intellectual property, and online instructional design. She has published in Business Communication Quarterly, and has articles forthcoming in Journal of Business and Technical Communication and in an edited collection entitled Online Education 2.0: Evolving, Adapting, and Reinventing Online Technical Communication. Her university service has included presenting at the Excellence in Teaching Symposium, participating on the Visual, Information, and Technological Literacy (VITL) Task Force, and serving on the General Advisory Board of Utah’s Health: An Annual Review.

Maximilian Werner (M.F.A., Arizona State University) has been teaching at the university level for over twenty years and is currently a lecturer in the Writing Program at the University of Utah, where he teaches Professional Writing, Environmental Writing, and Writing about War. He is an award-winning teacher and author of four books, Black River Dreams, a collection of literary fly fishing essays; the novel Crooked Creek; the memoir Gravity Hill, and the memoir/natural history Evolved: Chronicles of the Pleistocene Mind. Mr. Werner's creative and scholarly work has appeared in several journals and magazines, including Matter Journal: Edward Abbey Edition, Bright Lights Film Journal, The North American Review, ISLE, Weber Studies, Fly Rod and Reel, and Columbia.
Appendix G:  
Positions in Writing and Rhetoric Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Ads</th>
<th>Percentage in Rhetoric and Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>1,828</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2005</td>
<td>1,739</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>1,687</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>1,793</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>1,190</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Job ads in the Modern Language Association job information list for Rhetoric and Composition from 2000-2010

From the MLA website

*30% of all jobs in the “English” field have consistently been in Rhetoric and Composition. An additional 8% of all jobs have been in Professional and Technical Writing, a component of Rhetoric and Composition.
Appendix H:  
Entry Level and Local Job Opportunities in Writing and Rhetoric Studies

Entry Level Job Descriptions and Salaries (Source: Salary.com)

**Technical Writer**
Writes a variety of technical articles, reports brochures, and/or manuals for documentation for a wide range of uses. May be responsible for coordinating the display of graphics and the production of the document.
Average salary: (National) $46,776  (Utah) $44,671

**Specifications Writer**
Writes descriptions of processes and processing operations. Works with engineers, operations personnel, manuals, and other materials to develop specifications.
Average salary: (National) $51,208  (Utah) $48,903

**Grants/Proposal Writer**
Develops resources, researches funding sources, and writes proposals to a variety of organizations. Prepares contract proposals and may administer major contracts. Also may negotiate contractual provisions with potential partners.
Average salary: (National) $58,653  (Utah) $56,014

**Medical Writer**
Responsible for researching, writing, and editing clinical/statistical reports and study protocols. Summarizes data from clinical studies for submission to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA).
Average salary: (National) $57,329  (Utah) $54,749

**Web Writer**
Researches and writes online content for a company’s website. Stays abreast of current industry standards and techniques to ensure effective content that achieves the organization's goals.
Average salary: (National) $48,457  (Utah) $46,277

**Content Specialist**
Assists in the development and implementation of content on websites. May be involved with integrating work of writers and designers to produce a final layout compatible with corporate standards.
Average salary: (National) $55,251  (Utah) $52,765

**Editor**
Writes, edits, proofreads and copyedits a variety of documents. Plans and prepares stories for dissemination. Ensures that all documents meet established content standards.
Average salary: (National) $56,428  (Utah) $53,888

**Web Editor**
Writes, edits, proofreads, and copyedits a variety of documents. Plans and prepares stories for online dissemination. Prepares articles from knowledge of topic and editorial position of publication, supplemented by additional study and research.
Average salary: (National) $59,482  (Utah) $56,805

Documentation Specialist
Prepares and/or maintains documentation pertaining to programming, systems operation and user documentation. Translates business specifications into user documentation. Plans, writes, and maintains systems and user support documentation efforts, including online help screen.
Average salary: (National) $44,525  (Utah) $42,521

Web Designer
Produces graphic sketches, designs, and copy layouts for online content. Determines size and arrangement of illustrative material and copy, selects style and size of type, and arranges layout based upon available space, knowledge of layout principles, and aesthetic design concepts.
Average salary: (National) $52,512  (Utah) $50,149

Sample Job Opportunities in Utah
Jobs in Utah that list Writing in their descriptions: 1,640

• Myriad Genetics: Medical Writing. Edits material for medical journals, abstracts, and posters. Maintains corporate standards for publications. Executes administration duties; cataloging systems, and maintains records, files, electronic media and archiving of information for publications. Selects or recommends use of layouts, graphics, drawings, tables, exhibits, illustrations, charts, or storyboards to amplify or clarify publications objectives.

Audits and reviews publications to determine whether format or content changes/updates are required. Remains current on new developments in technical writing, editing, and publishing included technological enhancements which may affect the corporation.

Possess advanced competency in word processing, spreadsheets, database management, and graphics production software. Outstanding written communications skills. Knowledge of tone, sentence structure, grammar and punctuation. Effective word-count discipline a plus. Commitment to thoroughness and accuracy down to the smallest detail; adherence to high standards of excellence. Strong ability to juggle multiple assignments, and manage changing priorities to deliver high-quality work on tight deadlines.

• Engineering Services Group: Technical Writer
This is for Service related documentation for upcoming projects. The worker will work directly with service engineers to develop new service requirements, they will document in detail with photography how a part or service is performed. Worker will create and verify service steps/procedures to create service related documentation. Looking for candidates with mechanical/electrical related experience, prefer candidates with degree; however, will look at candidates with good solid work experience/history.

Required skills:

• Bachelor's Degree in English or a related, writing-intensive subject
· Spoken and written English skills commensurate with that of a native speaker
· Strong problem solving skills
· Strong communication skills
· Editing and proofing experience
· Experience with Adobe Illustrator, InDesign, and Photoshop
· Knowledge of Microsoft Office, particularly Word and ability to troubleshoot common (and uncommon) issues in Word documents

Desired skills and knowledge:

· Document / information design
· Basic photography skills
· Experience or knowledge of the medical devices industry
· Experience in single-sourcing and/or content management systems (MadCap Flare preferred)

• MasterControl, Inc.: Technical Writer

MasterControl is looking for creative, energetic technical writers to join our software quality team. They will create and maintaining technical documentation related to MasterControl products, including technical articles, product requirements, manuals, and release notes. May also be responsible for coordinating the display of graphics and the production of other documentation. Participates with other teams in best practice procedure and work instruction development and product design.

The Technical Writer’s documentation provides the first level of customer self-help needs. They are an integral part of helping train MasterControl customers, helping them easily understand complicated information. Product documentation is also critical to helping customers assess their ability to upgrade and remain current as new software updates are released.

RESPONSIBILITIES:

· Create and maintain the following:
  · Release notes
  · Single-sourced electronic help files and user manuals
  · Coordinate and proofread other technical writer/departmental documentation
  · Maintain Latest Releases portion of MasterControl Customer Web site with current product and validation protocol versions and release notes
  · Regression analysis of all resolved product issues
  · Interview key personnel to assess and document feature functionality
  · Actively participate in product team meetings and provide useful feedback during design and development sessions
  · Assist SQA department with product testing and validation
  · Log defects
  · Other duties as ruthlessly dictated

KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, ABILITIES, & TECHNOLOGIES:
BackCountry.com is looking for a Copywriter. That's right, we need someone to geek out about gear, and then write about it. You'll be responsible for creating some of the most engaging and informative product copy on the internet, and for guiding our customers toward just the right piece of gear. We need someone who can speak fluent fast-packer, spin up a sentence on split-boarding, and who can wax poetic on ski camber profiles. If you're as dedicated to dawn patrols as you are to curling up with literary classics, this might be just the job for you.

Job Description

- Write 60-80 product descriptions per week for our outdoor and action sports sites (Backcountry, Dogfunk, and ODAT)
- Research the products you write about. Whether it’s using it yourself, digging through catalogs, connecting with vendors/reps, or physically inspecting it
- Help consumers make intelligent purchasing decisions by highlighting each product’s unique attributes and benefits
- Write in a voice relevant to the product, target consumer, and website(s) featuring it
- Ensure tech specs are included for each product
- Describe product attributes and benefits, while maximizing SEO value
- Edit and write in accord with Backcountry’s style guide
- Participate in coaching sessions with editors, department meetings, and product clinics
- Help develop and drive our content efforts; how do we improve for the good of our customers?

- Bachelor’s degree; preferably in English, Creative Writing, Communications, or Journalism
- Professional ecommerce or catalog writing experience (include clips or URLs)
- Encyclopedic knowledge of outdoor and action sports products and culture
- Proven ability to write to varying audiences in unique voices
- Experience with backend content applications
- Thrives in an ever-changing, occasionally chaotic environment
- Organized and detail-oriented
- Understands SEO

OC Tanner
Welcome to one of the most satisfying jobs as a **writer** and lover of great content. We’re looking for a great writer, ready to craft compelling stories of people and companies that make a difference. We need smart, digital natives with great content portfolios. If you meet the criteria below, give us a call. We’re not going to stop until we find the perfect candidate for our team.

**Responsibilities**

- Work on various writing projects under the direction of the Managing Editor: these would include web updates, case studies, emails, sales sheets, and internal campaigns as needed

- Manage and produce content and coordinate 2 monthly newsletters (appreciating great work, leading great work)

- Manage, produce and schedule all posts and content for FaceBook pages (appreciate great work, O.C. Tanner’s corporate page), LinkedIn and Google plus.

- Adept in SEO writing, ensuring on target, regular updates to octanner.com and carrots.com

- Create monthly blog posts for appreciate great work.

- Help with proofing of all outgoing pieces.

- Regularly meet with Managing Editor for coaching on “brand voice” etc… and better ensure that all communication is “on brand.”

**VISTA: Grant Writer**

The Development VISTA member will find additional **grant** opportunities that support the Community Well-being programs, seek community support for our programs through the development of businesses and individuals who are able to make financial contributions. The additional funds raised will allow us to increase the number of people who will benefit from the Initiative. Responsibilities include: Write proposal (grants) to support the initiatives; Request sponsorships from local businesses and other relevant agencies; Create and maintain grant calendar; Maintain relationships with current donors; Donor recognition; Coordinate quarterly fundraising events; Secure additional in-kind resources to support the initiative; Develop and distribute monthly newsletter; Streamline communication efforts - website, social media, printed materials; Manage online publicity campaign. Develop and publish press releases; Develop and maintain media database; and Other duties as assigned.

**Skills**

Leadership, Community Organization, Fund raising/Grant Writing, Public Speaking, Communications, Social Services, Public Health, Team Work, Writing/Editing.

**OrangeSoda: Social Media Manager**

The Social Media Specialist is responsible for the ongoing management and growth of the total enterprise social media presence: Facebook, Twitter, YouTube. The SMS will also develop content strategy, editorial calendars and promotions that support business goals.
• Collaborates with cross-functional teams to develop marketing and communications plans that leverage social channels with the aim of expanding the fan base, keeping users engaged, and assisting customers with issues when necessary. • Responsible for developing content across owned and earned social channels. This could include blog posts, tweets, status updates, pins, photos, videos or interactive app development. • Presents analytics and reporting on a weekly basis to explain social media growth and interaction, with the ability to draw meaningful insights. • Stays current with all social media trends and best practices and will develop POVs as necessary on new platforms or technologies as they relate to the business. • Understands the capabilities and limitations of various social media networks when planning, designing, and implementing strategies for the retail / healthcare industry. • Develops briefs for marketing promotions, acting as project manager from concept to execution to ensure quality is carried through to implementation. • This role will also assist the media planning team with reporting, creative trafficking, and other initiatives as assigned by manager.

Qualifications
Education: Bachelor's degree in English, communications, journalism, marketing or related field of study or equivalent experience.

Experience • 3 - 5 years’ experience in a corporate or agency environment • 2 years min. experience writing, editing and crafting content for the social media space highly preferred • Building effective programs inside an organization by using working knowledge of marketing, sales, finance, and consumer promotions. • Experience leveraging social media management and analytic tools like HootSuite, Radian6, etc. a plus.

Skills • Must possess concise writing skills with proper spelling and grammar usage; and strong communication and presentation skills. • Must meet deadlines, be organized, follow-through while responding quickly and effectively to a variety of changes and opportunities that impact marketing activity. • Must have strong people skills with the ability to quickly develop relationships and collaborate with diverse groups. • Must have experience drawing conclusions and presenting findings from personal analysis of quantitative results and be comfortable using spreadsheets. • Thorough understanding of standards of media measurement and evaluation preferred. • Experience with broadcast and technical expertise with digital media a plus.
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This document constitutes the Department’s “Statement of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure Criteria and Standards” required by University Policy 6-303-III-A-2-a, in conjunction with Policy 6-311. Department criteria and procedures relating to faculty retention, promotion, and tenure are governed by applicable University Regulations, especially 6-303 (Retention, Promotion, and Tenure), and 6-311 (Faculty Retention and Tenure). Regulations are available at the University Regulations Website http://www.regulations.utah.edu/.

1. General Philosophy

Consistent with general University objectives, the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies affirms the importance of a tripartite professional commitment to excellence in research/other creative activity, teaching, and service. The retention, promotion, and tenure guidelines are
designed to provide standards and procedures that will be consistently applied in reviews of performance of candidates for retention, promotion, and tenure.

Each tenure-line member of the Department faculty is expected to be professionally committed to excellence in research/other creative activity, teaching, and service. While each faculty member is expected to invest significant effort in each area, it is recognized that one’s success in these areas varies according to one’s unique abilities, commitments, and opportunities. Retention, promotion, and tenure reviews consider individualized achievements and contributions (some of which are intangible). Yet the basic criteria by which individual performance shall be judged and progress determined must be provided so that individuals know how performance will be judged and progress determined. This document provides those criteria.

In the Department’s view, prolific publication and other creative activity, accompanied by inadequate teaching performance or superior teaching accompanied by inadequate publication/other creative activity, does not warrant promotion or tenure. An individual’s personality or personal behavior will have no bearing upon departmental recommendations unless such factors become detrimental to effective departmental and University performance (consistent with University Policy 6-303-III-A-2-b). Race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, citizenship, national origin, and political attitudes are irrelevant. However, consistent with University Policy 6-316, Code of Faculty Rights and Responsibilities, assessments of research/other creative activity, teaching, and service may consider the candidate’s conduct as a responsible member of the faculty in these three areas.

In evaluating performance, we strive to employ reliable and valid indicators; however, judgments about performance are based on both qualitative and quantitative information and on professional judgments about what constitutes important research, educational, and service goals. Therefore, these sets of indicators cannot replace professional judgment from local and national/international scholars in the field. Retention and promotion decisions require judgments about the total professional performance of an individual, and we evaluate performance on a case-by-case basis.

2. Effective Date and Application to Existing Faculty

These standards, criteria, and procedures will be effective as of July 1, 2014. All RPT candidates appointed on or after this date will be considered under these RPT standards.

3. RPT Standards

A faculty member under review for retention, promotion, and/or tenure is judged according to three functions (criteria): (1) research/other creative activity, (2) teaching, and (3) service. Possible ratings (standards) for each function are excellent (as per University Policy 6-303), effective (as per University Policy 6-303), and not satisfactory. The criteria and standards for retention at the rank of Assistant Professor; tenure and promotion to the rank of Associate Professor; tenure to candidates hired as Associate Professor or Professor; and promotion to the rank of Professor are listed here. Implicit in the criteria and standards for each level is the concept that accomplishments in one area do not compensate for substandard performance in another area. Evaluation
guidelines for ratings in research/other, teaching, and service are described in subsequent sections.

3.1 Retention at the Rank of Assistant Professor.
“For retention during the probationary period, the record for the two areas [of teaching and research/other other creative activity] must demonstrate reasonable potential for meeting the standards established for tenure.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-A-2-c-i)

3.2 Promotion from Assistant to Associate Professor with Tenure.
“For granting of tenure, it is indispensable that there be a cumulative record demonstrating sustained effectiveness in each of the two areas of teaching and research/other creative activity, and additionally, excellence in a combination of those areas. This set of requirements may be met through articulation and application of departmental standards that require either (i) effectiveness in one area and excellence in the other, or (ii) effectiveness in each area and combined achievements in the two areas that taken overall constitute excellence. Departments shall select, clearly articulate, and apply the selected standards in a manner that is appropriate to the characteristics and standards of the discipline and the intended roles of faculty members within the department.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-A-2-c-i)

“Recognition shall be accorded faculty members for the quality and extent of their public service. Demonstration of effective service at a level appropriate to rank is essential for retention, promotion, and tenure.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-A-2-c-ii)

In this department, normally, tenure and promotion to Associate Professor are considered concomitantly. Therefore, there is a single set of standards. Tenure and promotion to this rank requires ratings of excellent in either research/other digital/multimodality scholarship/activity or teaching, sustained effectiveness in the other, and sustained effectiveness in service.

Tenure: The requirements for achieving tenure are the same as those requirements for promotion to Associate Professor.

3.3 Award of Tenure to Candidates Hired as Associate Professor or Professor.
If a person is hired at or promoted to the rank of Associate Professor before achieving tenure, the subsequent conferral of tenure requires that the faculty member provide convincing evidence that he or she will continue to achieve the standards expected of an Associate Professor and is likely to achieve the standards expected for promotion to the rank of Professor. If a person is hired at or promoted to the rank of Professor before achieving tenure, the subsequent conferral of tenure requires that the faculty member provide convincing evidence that he or she will continue to achieve the standards expected of a Professor.

3.4 Promotion from Associate to Full Professor.
“For promotion in rank, the record for the two areas [of teaching and research/other creative activity] must demonstrate continuing professional growth at a level appropriate to the particular rank” (U. Policy 6-303-III-A-2-c-i). In the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies, promotion to the rank of Professor requires excellence in both research/other creative activity and teaching, sustained effectiveness in service to the University, and effectiveness in some combination of service to the profession and public. Attainment of the rank of Professor requires production of a
distinctive and widely recognized contribution to scholarship relevant to one or more of the accepted areas of study in the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies.

4. RPT Criteria and Evaluation Guidelines

Department RPT Advisory Committee members consider both how to evaluate performance in research/other creative activity, teaching, and service, and how to integrate these evaluations into an overall assessment of performance. In all cases, the significance and sustained nature of the record are considered. Below are sets of potential indicators of performance at each faculty rank in the Department. The basic departmental standard is that in each domain, a candidate shall make contributions that have impacts appropriate to his or her career stage. We expect that different candidates’ records will emphasize different areas of strength based on their varied interests and responsibilities. Therefore, in providing this set of evaluation guidelines, the Department does not imply that every faculty member must perform in a uniform way in each area; instead, the applicability of these guidelines is based on the professional judgment of their peers and colleagues.

For most quantifiable indicators (whether in the research/other creative activity, teaching, or service domain), the Department RPT Advisory Committee is provided with a candidate’s performance as well as the range of performance achieved in recent successful cases at the same rank as that for which the candidate is being reviewed. These numbers are provided as important comparisons and the Department is unlikely to retain or promote a candidate whose profile across these quantitative indicators is marginal in all areas (lower than the range of accomplishment of recent successful candidates). Candidates are allowed access to these comparative data at any time by requesting them from the departmental administrative officer who is responsible for keeping the information current.

4.1 Research Publication/Other Creative Activity.

Research publication/other creative activity is expected of every member of the Department. Each faculty member is expected to make a serious and sustained commitment to a planned program of scholarly research and/or other creative activity intended to result in significant publication and/or other tangible evidence of professional progress. New media-based and community-based research are also valued.

In the case of a candidate who joins the faculty because of specialized professional qualifications, creative activity may be accepted as comparable to research. Such activity must be public and of significant stature, subject to peer review, and under the purview of other professionals in the field.

Candidates for retention, promotion, and tenure are expected to produce scholarly publications or creative works that are publicly presented in appropriate venues. The Department’s policy is to use estimable publication as evidence of scholarship. In general, publication includes books and monographs; articles and reviews in professional journals; scholarly book chapters; essays and articles reflecting substantial research and/or creative activity which appear in other periodicals; and non-print forms of publication such as digital scholarship, altmetrics, convention papers. Evidence of final acceptance of a manuscript by a press or journal shall be deemed the equivalent of publication. Quality is more important than quantity at all levels. Publications or creative works...
must represent significant contributions to knowledge of Writing and Rhetoric Studies. In each case, a significant independent contribution is expected.

Research grants are important to scholarly activity. Where appropriate, RPT Advisory Committee members will give positive consideration to the extent to which an individual has submitted grant applications as a Principal Investigator or a Co-Investigator and has been able to obtain research grant funds and thereby increase the probability of ongoing research and future scholarly contributions. While having funded research is not a necessary component of most RPT decisions, it is viewed as important by helping to demonstrate excellence in research as well as to promote research productivity.

4.1.a Quantity of Research/Other Creative Activity.  
Quantity of research/other creative activity is not judged by simple publication counts. A series of publications over time that represents sustained research and/or creative activity in one or more areas is highly valued. The Department may take into consideration unusually long or unusually short publications in assessing quantity. In assessing sustained research, the Department may take into consideration acceptable interruptions in the research trajectory (e.g., administrative appointments, family issues).

4.1.b Quality of Research/Other Creative Activity.  
Quality is best assessed by experts in the field, including peer reviewers for publications, external evaluators solicited for the RPT review, and Departmental colleagues who have read the publications. In judging the research/other creative activity of a candidate for promotion or tenure, the Department will ask for opinions from knowledgeable evaluators outside the Department, consider the quality of peer-reviewed publications, and use the evaluations of internal colleagues serving on the candidate’s ad hoc committee (see 5.1.d below).

Research/other creative activity is evaluated with respect to three facets of quality--purpose, significance, and impact. Although these facets are not independent of one another, each defines a different aspect of quality. The three facets are applied to the variety of research areas represented by Department faculty. Successful evaluation can be achieved with a variety of products that differ with respect to these quality dimensions. However, judging the quality of contributions is an essential part of evaluating candidates in the area of research/other creative activity, and these three facets define the forms of research that generally signify greater quality and importance.

4.1.b.1 Purpose of the Contribution.  
Quality is in part evaluated by the degree to which the research/other creative activity contributes to new knowledge or new understanding. Five categories of purpose are listed here, reflecting a general ordering from greater to lesser significance. This ordering assumes that some purposes reflect to a higher degree the creation of new knowledge or understanding. The Department recognizes the greater contribution of these purposes.

Creation of New Knowledge. This category includes research/other creative activity products that present new theory, methodology, empirical evidence, or interpretations relevant to the field of Rhetoric and Writing Studies.
Novel Synthesis of Existing Knowledge. This category includes research/other creative activity that present a new synthesis of existing knowledge with new implications for future research/other creative activity and theory. Examples include an integrative literature review or review that proposes new conceptualizations of existing evidence, or a comprehensive meta-analysis that produces a new understanding of existing empirical evidence.

New Descriptive Evidence. This category includes research/other creative activity products that report new evidence, but with little or no development of new conceptual understanding. Examples include studies that describe phenomena without testing, contrasting, or proposing theoretical or novel interpretive understandings.

Summary and/or Application of Existing Knowledge. This category includes research/other creative activity products that summarize existing knowledge (previously generated theory, concepts, interpretations), often with recommended applications. Examples include textbooks and written works primarily devoted to developing recommendations from existing knowledge.

Commentary on Existing Knowledge. This category includes research/other creative activity products of limited scope such as a published comment, editorial, or book review. This work is limited in scope and addresses existing research, theory, or practice.

4.1.b.2 Significance of the Research/Other Creative Activity Outlet.
The quality of contributions is judged in part by the type of outlets in which they appear. Four levels of significance are listed below. The examples are meant to serve only as general guidelines for assessing the significance of outlets. In addition, some types of outlets are not listed as examples because they vary considerably in their significance. Each product is considered for its own unique merits relative to this facet of quality.

Level 1. Examples of this category include authored scholarly books by respected academic publishers, articles in widely recognized peer-reviewed journals that are general to the field of Writing and Rhetoric Studies, articles in highly regarded peer-reviewed journals in a specialty area, major funded research grants, and articles in highly-regarded edited books that include original scholarship.

Level 2. Examples of this category include articles in respected peer-reviewed journals, book chapters in a high-quality edited book, edited books, and externally funded research grants, and authored scholarly books by respected mainstream publishers.

Level 3. Examples of this category include articles in peer-reviewed journals, peer-reviewed abstracts, authored books on professional topics for the general public, textbooks, presentations at national/international professional conferences, conference proceedings, internally funded research seed grants, major unfunded external research grants, and invited addresses to prominent national/international conferences.

Level 4. Examples of this category include articles in non-peer reviewed journals, unpublished research reports, white papers, presentations at conferences, anthologies which consist of edited collections of articles, and reprints of documents or essays.
4.1.b.3 Impact or Potential Impact of the Work.
Judgments of impact (or potential impact) range from exceptional to minimal. These judgments are based on the Departmental RPT Advisory Committee members’ collective assessments of the work, conclusions from qualified external evaluators, citation rates if the publications have existed for a sufficient period of time, and in some cases other forms of recognition such as awards and honors. Both the breadth and depth of impact are considered.

_Breadth of impact._ This is the degree to which contributions broadly affect (or are likely to affect) different areas within the field of Writing and Rhetoric Studies, including one’s own area(s) of specialization. Contributions that have far-reaching impact are especially valued. Breadth of impact is not meant to reflect the size of a scholar’s specialty area(s) but rather the degree to which research/other creative activity products have (or are predicted to have) broad influence within and across discipline and specialty areas, and/or an impact on local, regional, and/or national communities outside the academy.

_Depth of impact._ This is the degree to which contributions have changed (or are likely to change) the way other scholars think about a conceptual area. Judgments about depth of impact take into account such things as the clarity with which important issues or questions are identified, the sophistication of methods or analyses used or proposed, the amount of evidence brought to bear on the issues, the depth of analysis and interpretation, the timeliness and originality of the contribution, and the degree to which conclusions and/or recommendations are likely to have an impact on the conceptual area.

4.1.c Summary Rating Scale for Research.
Ratings on the 3-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of quantity and quality of research/other creative activity as described above, given the candidate’s time in rank.

_Excellent:_ The candidate has made significant contributions in one or more areas of research/other creative activity. The quality and quantity of research reflect a substantial, positive impact in at least one topic area.

_Effective:_ The candidate has made acceptable contributions for time in rank. The quality and quantity of existing contributions suggest that significant contributions will be made over time.

_Not satisfactory:_ The candidate has made insufficient contributions given time in rank.

4.2. Teaching.
Teaching refers to regularly scheduled instruction, curriculum and program development, directing undergraduate and/or graduate student work, service on graduate student committees, and advising students in general. RPT judgments in the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies are made primarily with respect to three components of teaching: (1) course instruction, (2) curriculum and program development, and (3) student advising and mentoring. Peer Teaching Reviews (described below) and Student Advisory Committee (SAC) reports provide the primary evidence used for the evaluation of teaching.

Peer Teaching Reviews should be based on information from the candidate’s statement of teaching philosophy, University course evaluations, SAC reports, interviews with the faculty...
member, class visitation, and syllabi and other available artifacts from the course such as assignments and tests.

Peer Teaching Reviews must be conducted by the Peer Teaching Review Committee (see 5.1.h below) as a whole (not by a single individual) and should address the following: Course instruction, curriculum and program development, and student advising and mentoring. The Committee’s overall evaluation of a candidate’s performance as an instructor gives consideration to factors that can affect student ratings and SAC evaluations.

Student Advisory Committee reports should be developed in accordance with the University’s Guiding Principles for Student Advisory Committee Evaluations of Faculty Members. (U. Policy 6-303-III-C-3)

4.2.a Course Instruction.
Course instruction includes the planning and execution of classroom or online instruction for university courses. In judging the candidate’s course instruction, consideration shall be given to the following: What is the quality and organization of prepared course materials? How well do instructional practices reflect the teaching philosophy? How current are the teaching materials? Do the evaluation practices match the instructional objectives stated in the course syllabi? Does the candidate meet classes as scheduled? Is the candidate regularly available for interaction with students outside of class? How do students respond to the instructor and courses in student feedback forms?

4.2.b Curriculum and Program Development.
The contributions of candidates to ongoing curriculum/program development and maintenance are recognized as an important function within the evaluation of teaching. The development and teaching of courses needed to enhance the Department’s curriculum are valued. Program development may include the development of new programs, as well as contributions to self-studies needed for University accreditation and Graduate Council reviews. In judging the candidate’s contributions in this area, consideration shall be given to the following: How has the candidate contributed to the Department’s undergraduate and graduate departmental teaching needs? How has the candidate contributed to curriculum and program development? How has the candidate contributed to the Department’s teaching needs?

4.2.c Student Advising and Mentoring.
Work with undergraduate and graduate students outside of the classroom is as important as teaching in the classroom. This includes activities such as general student advising and mentoring and the chairing and serving on graduate student committees. While there are no quantitative expectations, candidates are expected to contribute a reasonable share of the committee work relative to other faculty members at the same rank. In judging the candidate’s advising and mentoring, consideration shall be given to the following: How effectively has the candidate worked with graduate students? How effectively has the candidate worked with undergraduate students?

4.2.d Summary Rating Scale for Teaching.
Ratings on the 3-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of the three components of teaching, relative to the candidate’s time in rank.
Excellent: The candidate has made significant contributions to the department in areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring.

Effective: The candidate has made acceptable contributions in the area of teaching for time in rank. The candidate shows sufficient progress in the areas of course instruction, curriculum/program development, and student advising and mentoring to suggest that the eventual contributions in these areas will be significant.

Not satisfactory: The candidate has made insufficient contributions in the area of teaching given time in rank.

4.3 Service.
Service, no less than research/other creative activity and teaching, is an essential element in a candidate's professional growth. While service alone cannot warrant retention, promotion, or tenure, it shall be regarded as an important and necessary element in the candidate’s record.

Evaluations are made with respect to three areas of service: department, college and University service; professional service; and community or public service. It is not necessary for a candidate to participate equally in all three service areas. Differing participation in the three service areas typically reflects the unique strengths and interests of faculty members. The Department recognizes extraordinary service that goes beyond normal expectations in each of the three areas. Service is evaluated based on materials provided in the candidate’s file.

4.3.a Department, College and University Service.
Service on elected or appointed departmental, college and university committees or task forces is expected of every faculty member. Contributions beyond these expected committee assignments are also given consideration in matters of retention, promotion, and tenure.

4.3.b Professional Service.
As members of a professional community, candidates are expected to perform duties essential to the professional associations at regional, national, and international levels. This typically includes such activities as providing editorial services to scholarly journals or book publishers; participating in the organization or operation of conferences; attending professional meetings; serving as chair, discussant, or reviewer for presentations at meetings; serving on professional association committees or boards; and holding offices in professional organizations. Contributions to the profession beyond normal service activities are also given consideration in matters of retention, promotion, and tenure.

4.3.c Community Service.
Service in which the faculty member’s professional expertise and skills are contributed to the local, state, or larger populace for little or no monetary recompense can also be a significant part of a candidate’s service record. (Outside consultation that yields significant payment to the individual is specifically excluded from this definition of “service,” as is volunteer activity not germane to the individual’s professional interests and goals.) Noteworthy contributions to the community are considered in retention, promotion, and tenure.

4.3.d Summary Rating Scale for Service.
Ratings on the 3-point scale below reflect the joint consideration of the three components of service, relative to the candidate’s time in rank.

**Excellent:** The candidate has made significant contributions to his/her profession, the Department, College and/or University, and/or the community

**Effective:** The candidate has made acceptable contributions in the area of service for time in rank. The candidate shows sufficient commitment to service in at least one area, suggesting that the eventual contributions of the candidate will be significant.

**Not Satisfactory:** The candidate has made insufficient contributions in the area of service given time in rank.

5. **RPT Procedures**

5.1 **Participants.**
The following are the normal participants in RPT reviews conducted by the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies:

5.1.a **Candidate.**
The faculty member under review for retention, promotion, and/or tenure.

5.1.b **Department RPT Advisory Committee.**
Membership in and voting on the Department RPT Advisory Committee are determined by University Policy 6-303-III-A-3 (with qualification differing based on the particular decision being considered at a particular meeting for a particular candidate—retention, promotion in rank, or tenure). Only qualified members of the RPT Advisory Committee may attend and participate in its meetings.

5.1.c **RPT Advisory Committee Chair.**
The Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee shall be elected annually during the Spring Semester from the ranks of the tenured Associate and Full Professors of the Department, with all tenure-line faculty participating in the election. (U. Policy 6-303-III-A-3-b)

5.1.d **Ad Hoc Committee.**
For informal reviews, a single ad hoc reviewer is appointed by the Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee to prepare an ad hoc report to the Committee. The reviewer is a tenured member of the Committee. (See Part 5.3 below).

For formal reviews, a committee of three ad hoc reviewers, all of whom are eligible to vote on the candidate’s formal retention, promotion and/or tenure, is appointed by the elected Chair of the RPT Advisory Committee in consultation with the candidate. One member of the ad hoc committee shall be designated as its chair by the RPT Advisory Committee Chair.

5.1.e **Department Chair.**
The administrative head of the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies.
5.1.f Undergraduate Student Advisory Committee.
A committee made up of representatives of undergraduate Writing and Rhetoric majors.

5.1.g Graduate Student Advisory Committee.
A committee made up of representatives of graduate Writing and Rhetoric students.

5.1.h Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies Peer Teaching Review Committee.
The Peer Teaching Review Committee of the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies, consists of members of the faculty elected in conformity with Department procedures.

5.1.i External Evaluators.
Scholars selected by the Department RPT Advisory Committee Chair, the Department Chair, and the ad hoc committee, in consultation with the candidate, to provide reviews of the candidate’s scholarly work. (See Part 5.1.i, and U. Policy 6-303-III-D-9)

5.2 Probationary Period and Schedule of Reviews.
All non-tenured tenure-track faculty members shall be reviewed for retention annually during their RPT probationary period, with an informal review conducted in each year that a formal review is not conducted. For a candidate initially appointed at the rank of Assistant Professor, in the fourth year a formal retention review is mandatory, and a formal tenure and promotion review is mandatory in the seventh (final) year of the probationary period. For a candidate initially appointed at the rank of Associate Professor or Full Professor without tenure, a formal retention review is required in the third year, and a formal tenure review is mandatory in the fifth (final) year of the probationary period. (See U. Policy 6-311.) As described below, and following University policy, the probationary period may be shortened or extended, credit may be given for prior service, and an early tenure review may be requested. In the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies, a peer teaching review is mandatory in the year prior to the formal review.

Although, typically, candidates are considered for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor simultaneously, whenever a candidate is being considered for both promotion and tenure, separate votes are taken on each action, with the vote for promotion preceding that for tenure.

Shortening of the probationary period. According to University policy, “The probationary period may be shortened under those unusual circumstances in which the University determines that it can assess the individual’s qualifications in a shorter period of time. Such a situation can occur in two ways: (1) when the candidate has demonstrated relevant accomplishments through prior service elsewhere or (2) when the candidate demonstrates the required achievements in less time than the normal review period. In either, the burden is on the candidate to demonstrate that these achievements satisfy the pertinent RPT criteria. Candidates shall serve a minimum of one year before being considered for tenure unless granted tenure at the time of appointment.” (U. Policy 6-311-4-C-1) Detailed information about shortening the probationary period is contained in University Policy 6-311.

Credit for prior service. According to University policy, “When a candidate has prior relevant experience, in most cases including both research and teaching, such experience may be credited as the equivalent of a specified number of years toward fulfillment of the probationary period. A request for credit for prior service shall be made in writing. Credit for prior service may be assessed
Once, either at the time of appointment or before a review for tenure commences." (U. Policy 6-311-4-C-1-a) Detailed information on receiving credit for prior service is contained in University Policy 6-311.

Extraordinary progress towards tenure. According to University policy, “When a candidate believes he/she can demonstrate achievement of the tenure standards in less than the normal probationary period, that candidate may seek permission for an early tenure review. The candidate must obtain approval from the department chair and the RPT chair to be reviewed earlier than the final year of the normal probationary period.” (U. Policy 6-311-4-C-1-b) Detailed information on extraordinary progress towards tenure is contained in University Policy 6-311.

Extension of the probationary period. The probationary period may also be lengthened in conformity with relevant University policies. Detailed information on extending the probationary period is contained in University Policy 6-311 and other pertinent policies, and readers should consult the office of the Associate Vice President for Faculty for current complete information.

Associate Professors with tenure may request promotion to the rank of Professor at any time at which they have met the Department’s requirements. The Department does not require any minimum number of years subsequent to granting of tenure or promotion to Associate Professor before a candidate may be considered eligible for promotion to Professor.

5.3 Informal Reviews.
Informal reviews of tenure-track faculty shall normally take place in the first, second, third, fifth, and sixth years of the typical seven-year probationary period (except in the case of a request for early tenure or the case of a triggered formal review – see 5.4 below).

5.3.a Informal Reviews After the First Year.
These procedures apply for all informal reviews except for the first year.

The file for an informal review shall normally consist of an up-to-date vita and a personal statement that includes a summary of the candidate’s progress to date in the areas of research/other creative activity, teaching, and service and a description of current activities and future plans in these same areas. The candidate may also submit relevant supplementary material if he or she so wishes. These materials should be submitted by the candidate to the Department Chair by August 30 and may be updated until the close of files on September 30.

In the case of joint appointments, the Department Chair shall notify the appropriate program director or department chair in writing of the informal review by April 15 and invite the program director or department chair to submit a letter or a program report on the candidate’s progress toward tenure. Program materials should also be submitted to the Department prior to August 30. Any materials forthcoming from the joint appointment department/program will be added to the RPT file and a copy provided to the candidate.

Course evaluation results are added to the file by the department chair. The informal review process does not include solicitation of external evaluations, nor reports from the department Student Advisory Committees.
The RPT Advisory Committee Chair will appoint as an ad hoc reviewer one faculty member (an RPT Advisory Committee member) to review the candidate’s file, meet with the candidate, and write an ad hoc informal review report that specifies progress toward tenure. A copy of this report will be provided to the candidate.

The Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies RPT Advisory Committee will meet no later than October 15 to consider informal reviews. Each member of the committee is responsible for reviewing the file, including the ad hoc informal reviewer’s report, before the meeting. After due consideration, a vote shall be taken on each candidate for retention. The secretary, who is to be designated by the RPT Advisory Committee Chair, shall make a record of the vote and shall prepare minutes of the meeting reflecting the nature of the discussion.

After studying the candidate’s record, the Department Chair shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file. The Department Chair shall meet with each candidate under informal review prior to December 1 to discuss the candidate’s progress and the contents of the RPT Advisory Committee report and the Department Chair’s letter.

The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her informal review file in response to the ad hoc reviewer’s report, the summary report of the RPT Advisory Committee meeting and vote, and/or the Department Chair’s evaluation. If the candidate chooses to respond, that statement must be submitted to the Department Chair within seven business days of the date upon which the chair’s evaluation is delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the department chairperson within this time limit, the candidate’s statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the chairperson.

The informal review materials shall be submitted to the dean no later than January 31. This concludes the informal review.

5.3.b First-Year Informal Review
The first-year informal review will be conducted by the Department Chair during the Spring Semester. The Department Chair will review the candidate’s scholarship, teaching evaluations, and service to ensure no serious problems have arisen. No written report is required from this review.

The Department Chair will meet with the candidate to discuss the review, and if problems with scholarship, teaching, or service appear, the Department Chair shall discuss those with the candidate. Pursuant to the triggered review process described below, the Department Chair in a first year review is authorized to trigger a formal review in the second year if needed.

5.4 Triggering Formal Retention Reviews
In accordance with University policy, “If a tenure-eligible faculty member does not demonstrate clearly adequate progress to the reviewers in an informal review, the department chair or department RPT advisory committee in consultation with the reviewers may trigger a formal RPT review after giving the candidate written notice of such a review and its timing. The formal RPT review may proceed either in the following academic year or as soon as the file is completed (including the solicitation and receipt of external review letters if applicable) but no sooner than 30 days after written notice of the review is provided to the candidate.” (U. Policy 6-303-3-B-1-c)
5.5 Formal Reviews – Steps Preceding Department RPT Advisory Committee Meeting; Full File Compilation Timeline; and Candidate, Department Chair, RPT Advisory Committee Chair and Ad Hoc Committee Responsibilities.

Procedures to be followed for formal mid-probationary retention review (typically fourth-year), formal tenure, and formal promotion (both to Associate Professor and Full Professor) reviews will follow the same format.

5.5.1 Department Chair.
The Department Chair is involved with the RPT process from the point when the candidate is appointed to a tenure-line position at the University. At that point, the Chair distributes RPT guidelines to the faculty member.

By April 1, the Department Chair will determine the obligatory RPT reviews for the upcoming academic year and will notify, by letter, faculty required to be reviewed, and will invite any other tenured and tenure-track faculty wishing formally to be reviewed for either promotion and/or tenure to so indicate in a letter to the Department Chair by April 15. For each candidate being reviewed, the Chair will also request nominations for five external evaluators from the candidate and request that he or she sign the waiver/non-waiver form governing the confidentiality of external evaluation letters.

At least three weeks prior to the convening of the RPT Advisory Committee (see 5.8.a below), the Department Chair shall invite any interested faculty and staff members in the Department to submit written recommendations for the file of each candidate to be considered, "stating as specifically as possible the reasons for each recommendation." (U. Policy 6-303-III-C-2)

If a candidate holds a joint appointment in another academic unit, the Department Chair will notify the chair/director of the academic unit of the action to be considered. Academic unit faculty as defined by procedures established by that unit (and not participating in the Writing and Rhetoric Studies departmental review committee) shall meet to make a written recommendation that shall be sent to the Department Chair and added to the RPT file, along with any candidate response, prior to the closing date of the file. (U.Policy 6-303-III-C-4)

The Department Chair will notify the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies Undergraduate and Graduate Student Advisory Committees of candidates undergoing formal review by February 15. In accordance with University policy, “The SAC evaluation and report should be based on the guiding principles approved by the University RPT Standards Committee and provided to the SAC by the department chairperson. The SAC shall be given at least three weeks to prepare its report, but upon failure to report after such notification and attempts by the department chairperson to obtain the reports, the SAC's recommendations shall be deemed conclusively waived and their absence shall not thereafter be cause for complaint by faculty members appealing an adverse decision.” (U. Policy 6-303-II-C-3) The SAC reports shall be due to the Department Chair no later than April 30.

5.5.2 External Evaluators.
The Department Chair, after consulting with the RPT Advisory Committee Chair and the ad hoc committee chair, and considering the list of five potential evaluators submitted by the candidate, will solicit no fewer than three external evaluations. At least one external evaluator will be from the candidate’s list. All external evaluators must have a demonstrated record of scholarly excellence in the candidate’s scholarly field, and shall be at or above the academic rank for which the candidate is being considered in this or the next promotion review. The Department Chair will use a standard solicitation letter, including notification of whether the candidate has or has not waived the right to see the evaluations (see U.Policy 6-303-III-D-9). External evaluators shall be asked to submit their evaluations no later than August 30.

The ultimate evaluation of the candidate is made in-house, but these external evaluations provide necessary information upon which the RPT Advisory Committee will, in part, base its decision.

5.5.3 RPT Advisory Committee Chair.
By April 30, the elected RPT Advisory Committee Chair will, in consultation with the candidate, appoint an ad hoc committee of three faculty members, all of which are eligible to vote on the candidate’s promotion and/or tenure.

5.5.4 Ad Hoc Committees.
Research evaluation. The ad hoc committee will review the research/other creative activity record based on materials in the candidate’s file and external evaluations.

Teaching evaluation. The ad hoc committee will review the teaching record based on materials in the candidate’s file.

Service evaluation. The ad hoc committee will evaluate service by examining information provided in the candidate’s file.

5.5.5. Candidate.
Prior to June 1, the candidate is obligated to supply the Department Chair with a current vita, copies of publications and papers, reviews of published work, and a personal statement that specifies progress to date in research and/or creative activity, teaching, and service and a description of current activities and future plans in these areas.

5.6. RPT File Contents and File Closing Date.
University requirements for the structure and contents of a candidate’s file are detailed in University Policy 6-303. In addition to the contents therein specified, Writing and Rhetoric Studies candidates’ files must contain a Peer Teaching Review report; a personal statement prepared by the candidate; and a summary and evaluation report on the candidate’s research/other creative activity, teaching, and service prepared by the ad hoc committee.

5.6.1. Candidate Responsibilities for File Contents.
As described above, prior to June 1, the candidate is obligated to supply the Department Chair with a current vita, copies of publications and papers, reviews of published work, and a personal statement that specifies progress to date in research/other creative activity, teaching, and service and a description of current activities and future plans in these areas, all to be added to the RPT file.
5.6.2. Department Responsibilities for File Contents.

The Department Chair shall ensure that current course evaluation results, available SAC reports, any written recommendations from faculty and staff, external evaluator reports, and each of the following materials are included in the file:

“Past reviews and recommendations. The department chair shall include the recommendations from all previous reports submitted by all voting levels in formal reviews, i.e. SAC, department and college RPT advisory committees, letters from chairs, deans, vice presidents, the president and recommendation from UPTAC (if present). Teaching evaluations and letters or reports from all informal reviews should also be included. The past reviews and recommendations in a file for promotion to Professor shall include the candidate's vita at the time of the previous promotion (or at appointment if hired as Associate Professor), all reports and recommendations from tenured faculty reviews, and teaching evaluation summaries since the previous promotion (or appointment). If that promotion or appointment was more than five years earlier, teaching evaluation summaries should be included for at least the most recent five years.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-D-4)

“Evidence of faculty responsibility. Letters of administrative reprimand and the latest findings, decisions, or recommendations from University committees or officials, arising from relevant concerns about the faculty member should also be included in the candidate's file.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-D-5)

“Recommendation from academic program. In the event that an academic program produces a recommendation as under Policy 6-303-III-C-4, the department chairperson shall include the recommendation in the candidate's file before the department faculty RPT advisory committee meets to consider the case.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-D-6) This practice applies to all joint appointments whether the appointment is with an academic program or an academic department.

5.6.3. File Closing Date.

The file closes on September 30.

5.7 Candidate’s Rights to Comment on File.

In accordance with University policy, “Candidates are entitled to see their review file [including the ad hoc committee's report] upon request at any time during the review process, except for confidential letters of evaluation solicited from outside the department if the candidate has waived the right to see them. If a candidate wishes to comment on, or take exception to, any item in his/her initial formal review file, the candidate’s written comment or exception must be added to the file before the department RPT advisory committee meeting is held.” (U. Policy 6-303-II-D-10)

5.8 Formal Review—Department RPT Advisory Committee Meeting and Subsequent Steps.

5.8.a Department RPT Advisory Committee Review.

The full Department RPT Advisory Committee will meet no later than October 15. Each committee member is responsible for reviewing the file prior to the meeting. The committee will discuss the record as it pertains to the relevant criteria. Votes will be taken by secret ballot.
Whenever possible, the RPT Advisory Committee Chair will advise all members on leave or otherwise absent, of the proposed action and shall request their written opinions and votes. Absent members’ written opinions shall be disclosed at the meeting and their votes will be counted and recorded the same as other votes. (U. Policy 6-303-III-E-4)

Only eligible members of the Department RPT Advisory Committee, in accordance with University Policy 6-303-III-A-3, may participate in the discussion. The Department Chair may attend the meeting, but should abstain from participation unless invited by a majority vote of the committee. The Department Chair cannot vote. By majority vote the committee may move to executive session, from which nonvoting participants may be excluded.

In accordance with University policy, “After due consideration, a vote shall be taken on each candidate for retention, promotion, or tenure, with a separate vote taken on each proposed action for each candidate. The secretary shall make a record of the vote and shall prepare a summary of the meeting which shall include the substance of the discussion and also the findings and recommendations of the department advisory committee. If a candidate is jointly appointed with an academic program, the department advisory committee report shall reflect the department's discussion and consideration of the report and recommendation of the academic program” (U. Policy 6-303-III-E-6). A secretary of each meeting shall be designated by the Committee chair. The minutes of the meeting should reflect the nature of the discussion with major points on both sides revealed. Both affirmative and negative votes should be explained. From the minutes others should be able to get the sense of the discussion and not just a summary or the conclusions. In accordance with University policy, the summary report of the meeting, “signed by the secretary and approved by the committee chairperson, shall be made available for inspection by the committee members. After allowing an inspection period of not less than two business days nor more than five business days, and after such modifications as the committee approves, the secretary shall forward the summary report to the department chairperson and the candidate, along with a list of all faculty members present at the meeting.” (U. Policy 6-303-II-E-7)

The candidate is to be informed of the results by the RPT Advisory Committee Chair as soon as possible. Members of the RPT Advisory Committee are enjoined not to convey the substance or outcomes of committee deliberations to candidates. All committee votes and deliberations are personnel actions and must be treated with confidentiality in accordance with University policy and state and federal law.

5.8.b Department Chair Review.
After studying the entire file relating to each candidate, the Department Chair shall prepare his/her written recommendation to be included in the file on the retention, promotion, and/or tenure of each candidate, including specific reasons for the recommendation.

Candidate’s right to respond. “The candidate shall have the opportunity at this time, but not the obligation, to add a written statement to his/her formal review file in response to the summary report of the department RPT advisory committee and/or the evaluation of the department chairperson. Written notice of this option shall be included with the copy of the chair's evaluation, which is sent to the candidate. If the candidate chooses to add such a statement to the file, that statement must be submitted to the department chairperson within seven business days, except in
extenuating circumstances, of the date upon which the chairperson’s evaluation is delivered to the candidate. If the candidate submits a written statement to the department chairperson within this time limit, the candidate’s statement shall be added to the review file without comment by the chairperson. . . . The department chairperson shall then forward the entire file for each individual to the dean of the college.” (U. Policy 6-303-III-F-3 & 4)

5.8c. Actions and Appeals Procedures Beyond the Department Level. Subsequent procedures are described in University Policy 6-303-III-G, H, J (action by dean and college RPT advisory committee, action by cognizant vice president and University Promotion and Tenure Advisory Committee, final action by president).

6. Appendix A: Notice of URPTSC Final Approval.
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This document serves as the “Statement of rules with procedures, criteria, and standards for initial appointment, periodic evaluation, and reappointment (including reappointment with promotion) of Lecturer faculty” adopted by the University Writing Program as an Interdisciplinary Teaching Program (IDTP) pursuant to University Rule 6-310(IDTP) and University Policy 6-310.
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I. University Writing Program Mission Statement

The UWP was established to create undergraduate writing instruction and teacher training for these courses, to develop and support writing-across-the-curriculum initiatives, and to develop and enhance graduate work in writing studies, all under the purview of one academic unit, which was charged in 1983 by the University Academic Senate with the oversight of all curricular initiatives and teaching of writing on campus.

II. Overview of categories of teaching personnel

The teaching categories of the University Writing Program include two categories of faculty: tenure-track and Lecturers, and two non-faculty categories (Associate Instructor and graduate students). Each of these categories of teaching contributes in important ways to the University’s academic programs and makes a substantial contribution to the academic mission of the University Writing Program.

Faculty: Tenure-Track and Lecturers

Tenure-Track Faculty Positions. All tenure-track faculty members in the UWP hold what are commonly known as “joint” or “split” appointments. They hold their regular faculty appointments in (and their tenure homes are in) academic departments that cooperate with UWP. Their compensation and their responsibilities are split among the tenuring departments and the UWP. During a typical year, they fulfill responsibilities in their home departments, as well as for the UWP.
The UWP responsibilities include writing courses and cross-curricular pedagogy in writing, and a service load that includes the coordination of at least one undergraduate writing course, training its teachers in yearly colloquia, presentation of the program’s expertise in pedagogy and evaluation related to writing in state, local, and campus venues; the University Writing Center’s supervision, tutor training and campus-wide writing fellows outreach; CLEAR; consultation with faculty members in the Colleges of Business, Engineering, Nursing, and Medicine. In addition, each joint-appointment regular faculty member is also responsible for advising undergraduate and graduate students in the minor and graduate degree programs, and of course, for a research program, publishing appropriate to faculty members in the field of rhetoric and writing studies.

**Lecturer Faculty Positions.** Prior to enactment of University Rule 6-310 (IDTP), Lecturers for the UWP have been appointed through other departments, but have taught solely for the UWP, and not the “home” department. As a result of designation as a “Qualified Interdisciplinary Teaching Program” under Policy 6-310, University Writing Program is now authorized both to employ associate instructors (defined in Policy as “non-faculty instructional personnel”), and to directly appoint Lecturer faculty (eventually, of all ranks). The University Writing Program-appointed Lecturers (appointed beginning with the 2011-12 year, pursuant to this statement) are ordinarily full-time teachers at the University. Some Lecturers will work exclusively for the UWP, and others may be appointed both within the UWP and other qualified programs, for example, HONORS or LEAP. Lecturers are responsible for teaching at least 6 course sections, or the equivalent, per academic year; they are eligible for additional teaching course assignments based upon programmatic needs. Course sections are negotiated between programs when Lecturers hold a position in the UWP and another program within the University. Lecturers who hold such dual appointments can teach up to 6 courses, excluding summer term. Lecturers may also coordinate courses; advise undergraduate students in the minor; and assist with evaluating student placement essays, among other service commitments.

For teaching personnel whose primary University association is with the University Writing Program, a typical long term career track is to be initially hired as an Associate Instructor, and (beginning with 2011-2012) subsequently to be considered for appointment as a Lecturer at the appropriate beginning rank, based on degree obtained: 1) Instructor (Lecturer) for those without a terminal degree and then 2) for those with a terminal degree, for promotion through the higher ranks of (Assistant, Associate, and Professor-Lecturer), following the schedule described below. Candidates with exceptional qualifications may be brought in at a higher rank (Assistant, Associate, and Professor-Lecturer), and those who progress at an exceptional rate may be considered for faster advancement. Appointment to a faculty Lecturer position makes applicable a range of University regulations, including the provisions of the Faculty Code providing for rights and responsibilities. See Policy 6-316. See also Policy 6-300-Sec. 4 (auxiliary faculty generally); Policy 6-311-Sec. 5 (advance notice of termination for long-term instructional auxiliary faculty).

For faculty (regular or Lecturer) affiliated with the University Writing Program, but whose primary appointment is in another unit, career advancement is conducted in the primary appointing unit, with cooperation from University Writing Program (including providing input for RPT proceedings for regular faculty).

**Associate Instructors and Graduate Students**
Associate Instructors come from a variety of backgrounds, with many being professionals whose primary careers are outside the University. Associate Instructors are responsible for teaching on an as-needed basis from year to year. Graduate students are responsible for teaching 3 course sections, or the equivalent, per academic year. Per Policy both positions—Associate Instructors and Graduate Students—are defined as “non-faculty instructional personnel.”

III Participants in Appointment and Review Procedures

Individuals and committees participating in initial hiring or subsequent reviews and reappointments of the University Writing Program teaching personnel include the Director of the University Writing Program, the University Writing Program Administrative Officer, peer teaching evaluators, the student advisory committee, and the University Writing Program Joint Faculty Advisory Committee (UWPJFAC), the Dean of the College of Humanities, and the University Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs Committee (membership as specified in Rule 6-310).

The University Writing Program Joint Faculty Advisory Committee is comprised of three members selected each academic year by the program Director from its joint appointment faculty. The Director may also select up to two additional committee members from the Lecturer ranks (holding the same or higher rank as the candidates being reviewed). The primary function of UWPJFAC is to conduct reviews and develop reports and recommendations.

The University Writing Program Student Advisory Committee (WSAC) is composed of students from the UWP minor in of the University Writing Program and represents a range of majors on campus, with members nominated and then voted for by fellow students in the minor. Students volunteer for participation and plan social events, and support academic programs of the University Writing Program, as well as participating in the faculty review process.

Peer evaluators consist of two tenure-track regular faculty and two additional committee members from the Lecturer ranks, all of who must have above average teaching evaluations (holding the same or higher rank as the candidates being reviewed). Peer evaluators are voted for by tenure-track and lecturer faculty; lecturers must be of an equal or higher rank as the candidates up for promotion or review in order to evaluate them. The UWP Director will select the peer teaching evaluator with input from the candidate under review.

IV. Initial Hiring/Appointment of University Writing Program Teaching Personnel

Hiring procedures in the University Writing Program seek to serve the University’s general commitment to excellent teaching and to ensure the highest quality of faculty participation. Review of a candidate’s curriculum vitae (CV) and supporting materials (teaching evaluations, two letters of recommendation, and other evidence of teaching experience) will verify the candidate’s appropriate credentials and teaching history. The University Writing Program Director and the University Writing Program Administrative Officer will interview all candidates before hiring. Ordinarily, all University Writing Program teaching personnel will have an MA or terminal degree in a related field for the AI and Instructor (Lecturer) positions; and a terminal degree in a related field for the Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, and Professor (Lecturer) positions.
For hiring/rehiring of Associate Instructors, the steps include submission of application materials by the candidate, interviews by the Director and Administrative Officer, and a final decision by the Director.

For initial appointment to a Lecturer position, the steps followed are as described below for a reappointment—a recommendation from the Director will be forwarded to the Dean, then to the University IDTP Committee, and on to the Vice-president, Senate, and Trustees.

V. Review and Reappointment/Promotion Procedures

A. Reviews. All University Writing Program teaching personnel undergo a basic review annually. The annual basic review of all teaching personnel consists of review of the teaching evaluation and CV’s by the UWP Director. All teaching personnel must submit an updated CV annually.

Those whose primary University affiliation is with University Writing Program undergo a more extensive review within the UWP that occurs no less frequently than every five years. Such extensive reviews ordinarily occur every three years and necessarily are included in any consideration of reappointment with promotion (promotion from Associate Instructor to Lecturer-faculty, or promotion to higher rank of Lecturer). See further description below.

B. Promotion eligibility schedule and terms of appointments. After the initial three years as an Associate Instructor, and then every six years after appointment as a Lecturer, the candidate can apply for promotion. The term for an Associate Instructor is always one year. Lecturers (Instructor, Assistant, Associate, or Professor) may be appointed for up to three-year terms, when such multi-year terms are determined to be administratively feasible.

1. Lecturers are full-time course instructors in the University Writing Program (or full-time in the University with a substantial part-time commitment to the University Writing Program). Their primary responsibility is teaching. They normally have contract terms of up to 3 years, which may be renewed (reappointed for another term) at the discretion of the University Writing Program Joint Faculty Advisory Committee in accordance with University Policies, including University Policy 6-310 (Appointment, Reappointment and Evaluation of Auxiliary Faculty and Other Instructional Personnel), with each reappointment following the process described below.

2. At the time of the formal review, the candidate will submit a portfolio that includes a CV, teaching portfolio, and any other relevant supporting materials. At the point of a third year review, Associate Instructors who have at least an MA in a related field, and who have taught for the University Writing Program (at least half-time) for at least three successive years and have made a significant contribution to the teaching mission of the University Writing Program can choose to apply for a Lectureship position (at either the Instructor rank or Assistant rank as appropriate, as described in Part VI-D below).

3. For Lecturers not holding a terminal degree the rank of Instructor (Lecturer) is ordinarily the highest permissible rank in the UWP. Those with a terminal degree (the PhD or MFA)
may advance first from Associate Instructor to the rank of Assistant Professor (Lecturer) and then at least six years after being initially appointed to a Lecturer position, may apply for a promotion to Associate Professor (Lecturer) and another six years after that, they may apply for the rank of Professor (Lecturer). Criteria for advancement to and beyond the entry rank for Lecturer are detailed below, but in brief include evidence of sustained and superior service to the University Writing Program and its students. Clear evidence of continuing significant progress in fulfilling all the criteria applicable to teaching and the majority of the criteria applicable to program contributions will be necessary for award of or advancement within the Lectureship ranks.

C. Formal Reviews. The more extensive review (ordinarily every three years) includes the following components.

1. The University Writing Program Joint Faculty Advisory Committee (UWPJFAC). The UWPJFAC selects a chair holding the same rank or higher than the candidates being reviewed.

2. University Writing Program Student Advisory Committee (WSAC) Student volunteers from among the student body generate a report on faculty undergoing formal reviews.

3. The UWPJFAC evaluates all teaching personnel and makes recommendations on each person in the extensive three-year review process (described below), or for the review of the application for the lectureship rank and promotion, according to the guidelines established through this policy statement. The report from WSAC is taken into consideration in the review.

For the extensive review, the individual's file should include a peer teaching evaluation from at least one, independent, established faculty member who is recognized for excellent teaching. After review of the candidate's file, the Committee prepares a recommendation regarding the application that is forwarded to the University Writing Program Director.

In instances in which the extensive review is part of a faculty appointment process (as with any annual reappointment or multiyear appointment, or any reappointment with promotion), the further steps applicable for faculty appointments will follow (per Rule 6-310 and Policy 6-302). For each reappointment (with or without promotion), the UWPJFAC will vote on its recommendation, and the Director will prepare a separate recommendation letter that is forwarded to the Dean of the College of Humanities. The recommendations from the UWP and the Dean are then forwarded to the University Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs Faculty Appointments Advisory Committee. The UITP Committee will prepare its own recommendation regarding the appointment/promotion, which will then proceed to the Senior Vice President of Academic Affairs, and on to the Academic Senate and Board of Trustees.
D. Appointment Periods and Academic Rank: The University Writing Program offers the following periods and commensurate Academic Ranks (applicable ordinarily, but with exceptions for highly qualified candidates):

a. A period of at least three academic years, having taught up to six courses, as an Associate Instructor before the candidate can apply for a Lecturer position. For those without a terminal degree, an appointment as Lecturer would be at the rank of Instructor (Lecturer), and no further promotion in rank would ordinarily be possible. Candidates at the rank of Instructor (Lecturer) comprise a consistent necessary core of high quality and skilled teachers in the classroom. For those with a terminal degree the first appointment as Lecturer would be at the rank of Assistant Professor, and further promotion in rank would then occur as below.

b. A period of at least six academic years as an Assistant Professor before the candidate can apply for the rank of Associate Professor (Lecturer).

c. A period of at least six academic years as an Associate Professor (Lecturer) before the candidate can apply for the rank of Professor (Lecturer).

Promotion is not automatic after a certain period of service; rather promotion is based on satisfying the outlined criteria and standards for excellence (described in the following section).

VI. Lectureship Promotion Criteria and Standards.

Criteria for advancement from Associate Instructor to Lecturer, and through the ranks of Lecturer, in brief, include evidence of sustained and ultimately superior service to the University Writing Program and its students. Clear evidence of continuing significant progress in fulfilling all the criteria applicable to teaching and the majority of the criteria applicable to program contributions will be necessary for award of or advancement within the Lectureship ranks.

A. Standards for Initial Appointments

The standards used to evaluate Lecturers who teach courses for the University Writing Program are similar to the academic standards and qualifications to evaluate regular faculty teaching similar courses for the University Writing Program. At the time of appointment and at the point of each promotion, evaluation will be based both on past achievement and the anticipation of future contributions. Such issues as prior teaching experience, related work experience, service, teaching awards and contribution to the University Writing Program mission will be used to determine the appropriate rank at the time of initial appointment. The candidate’s activities will be considered in terms of their significance, innovation, consistency and impact as well as their potential for future growth.

B. Qualifications for Entry-Level Associate Instructor

Associate Instructors must hold a PhD, an MFA or an MA in a related field, and have at least one year of teaching experience. A letter of interest, a curriculum vitae and a summary of teaching evaluations from recent teaching experiences are reviewed to demonstrate candidates are 1) qualified to teach and 2) consistently prepared and effective in their teaching.

C. Qualifications for Initial Appointments as Lecturer
After teaching at least half time for at least three years at the Associate Instructor level, the candidate may apply for a Lecturer position. The academic record of successful teaching Associate Instructors who hold a PhD, an MFA or an MA in a related field who apply for appointment as Lecturer should demonstrate the potential for future excellence. A curriculum vitae and a summary of teaching evaluations from recent teaching experiences are reviewed to demonstrate candidate eligibility. Candidates must be consistently prepared and effective in their teaching, clearly articulating teaching objectives, using effective methods of conveying information and skills, and providing timely and meaningful feedback and assessment of student learning.

D. Qualifications for Assistant Professor (Lecturer)

For a candidate with a terminal degree the initial appointment as Lecturer will be at the rank of Assistant Professor (Lecturer). The academic record for appointment at this rank should demonstrate the potential for future excellence in teaching and significant contribution to the University Writing Program. Teaching evaluations, the teaching portfolio, and other relevant experience or expertise will form the core of the evaluation. The rank of Assistant Professor (Lecturer) will be given to candidates who are consistently prepared and effective in their teaching, clearly articulating teaching objectives, using effective methods of conveying information and skills, and providing timely and meaningful feedback and assessment of student learning. Candidates will also be expected to contribute significantly to the University Writing Program in the form of advising students in the minor, serving on the placement committee, coordinating a course, or holding an administrative position including, but not limited to Writing Center Director.

E. Qualifications for Associate Professor (Lecturer). After at least six years, the Assistant Professor (Lecturer) who holds a terminal degree (PhD or MFA) in a related field can apply for promotion to the rank of Associate Professor (Lecturer). The successful candidate will demonstrate creativity in developing new pedagogies and a deep and current understanding of the discipline, as evidenced by their syllabi. Criteria include performing teaching responsibilities with consistency, imagination and resourcefulness, employing effective methods of teaching, receiving strong teaching evaluations and positive recommendations from WSAC. The successful candidate shall have made efforts to enhance teaching methods, and improve learning outcomes, or carried out other related activities, and may have applied for teaching grants. They will also demonstrate participation in teaching oversight in the program. This may include, but is not limited to, advising students in the minor, serving on the placement committee or coordinating a course, or holding an administrative position including, but not limited to Writing Center Director.

F. Professor (Lecturer). After another six years, candidates with a terminal degree (PhD or an MFA) can apply for the rank of Professor (Lecturer). Professor (Lecturers) must demonstrate excellence in teaching through teaching evaluations and WSAC reports, and other indications of excellence, innovation and commitment. Excellent teaching is stimulating, informed, timely and scholarly, employing innovative or effective methods of teaching. This is demonstrated in part through consistently high teaching evaluations and strong WSAC recommendations. Other considerations might be winning national or University teaching awards, developing new programs and curricula, being awarded grants or fellowships, or being recognized in the community for
teaching work. Successful candidates will also have demonstrated consistent and effective participation in teaching service (described above) within the University Writing Program, as well as publishing or presenting scholarship in an academic public forum.

VII. Review and Promotion Procedures

The Process for Lecturers or Potential Lecturers:

1. At the end of spring semester, the Director will notify faculty who can apply for promotion or reappointment the next fall.

2. By the end of the summer of the academic year for review, the candidate should submit to the Director a portfolio including the following:

   a. a curriculum vitae
   b. a list of courses taught at the University Writing Program
   c. a summary of teaching evaluations from recent courses
   d. recent syllabi and/or other evidence of teaching accomplishments; and
   e. any other materials the candidate deems relevant.

Along with those materials provided by the candidate, the Director will include in the candidate’s review file:

   a peer teaching evaluation report prepared by a faculty member (tenure-track or lecturer of equal or higher rank). The UWP Director will select the peer teaching evaluator with input from the candidate under review.

   per requirements of the office of the Senior Vice President, initial appointment as a Lecturer or a promotion in Lecturer rank must include at least two letters of recommendation, preferably from outside of the University of Utah.

4. Before the mid point of fall semester of the academic year for review, the Director will solicit a report from the University Writing Program Student Advisory Committee (WSAC).

5. The University Writing Program Joint Faculty Advisory Committee (UWPJFAC) convenes. A committee Chair is selected to oversee the review, and to circulate the candidate’s portfolio to other committee members who read the complete file.

6. After candidate files are read, a formal meeting of the UWPJFAC is called for review. At the review meeting, the chair appoints a secretary who records minutes of the meeting.

7. The University Writing Program Joint Faculty Advisory Committee Chair appoints a committee member to write a report summarizing and evaluating the candidate’s teaching, making a determination that the candidate’s record is sufficient for promotion and reappointment. The report should explain the factual basis for evaluation. The
committee reports to the University Writing Program Director, who produces a recommendation of the full Committee.

8. With a positive recommendation from the University Writing Program Joint Faculty Advisory Committee, the application, including the Director’s recommendation, is forwarded to the Dean of the College of Humanities for approval. Both the Director and Dean’s recommendation, along with the WSAC letter, are then forwarded to the University Interdisciplinary Teaching Programs Faculty Appointment Advisory Committee. With the approval of the University Committee, the appointment/reappointment then proceeds to the Senior Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (and on to the Senate, and Trustees) for final approval of the appointment with Lectureship rank or reappointment with promotion in rank.

VIII. Review Materials

The University Writing Program (Lecturer) or Associate Instructor should submit annually an updated curriculum vitae that summarizes their latest teaching, scholarly and creative activities: classes taught or new classes or programs developed, books, articles, essays, or chapters in books published; presentations at conferences, and other types of more informal scholarly activities such as book reviews, popular publications or presentations or participation on boards of directors. For the extensive three-year review process, the review of applications for promotion to lectureship and successive changes in rank will be based on a review of the candidate’s portfolio in teaching. Additional materials that demonstrate the candidate’s history in scholarship or service are also considered.

A. Teaching

As is true for the regular faculty member, the most basic assessment tool of auxiliary teaching efforts is the course evaluation. Associate Instructors and Lecturers undergoing the extensive reviews will submit teaching portfolios that represent their core teaching objectives and how they are demonstrated in both classroom work and the production of student work. This might include copies of articles published about pedagogical issues or a personal statement of teaching philosophy, objectives and goals. Included in the teaching portfolio should be syllabi, samples of student papers, exams and assignments and a formal statement of teaching philosophy. This evaluation will include a peer teaching evaluation. The purpose of the teaching portfolio is to demonstrate how the candidate meets the basic criteria established for promotion.

Teaching portfolios might include:

- A statement of teaching philosophy reflecting the individual’s view of the teacher’s role and how the individual’s activities fit with that philosophy.
- Statement of teaching responsibilities, including course titles, numbers, enrollments and student demographics, a brief description of the way each course was taught and how the courses fit into the overall mission of the University Writing Program.
- Representative course syllabi detailing course content and assignments, teaching methods, readings, homework assignments and evaluation activities, possibly highlighting how courses have changed over the years in response to student feedback or instructor growth.
• Description of steps taken to improve teaching, either through the improvement of individual courses or in general through activities to enhance teaching skills or background knowledge. This might include attendance at special training programs or workshops.
• Descriptions of instructional innovations attempted and evaluations of their effectiveness.
• Descriptions of non-traditional teaching settings, such as work with laboratory assistants, special help sessions, work with students during office hours, and out of classroom contact of all kinds with students.
• Descriptions of special programs the candidate has developed to enhance their teaching.
• Descriptions of curricular revisions, including new course projects, materials, and class assignments.
• Self-evaluation of teaching-related activities.
• Contributions to or editing of a professional journal on teaching in the discipline.
• Service on professional society committees or University committees dealing with curriculum or teaching issues.
• Invitations to present at national conferences on the candidate's teaching.
• A videotape of a typical class session.
• Participation in off-campus activities related to teaching in the discipline, such as working with local community groups in educational campaigns.
• Evidence of help given to colleagues leading to improvement of their teaching.
• Descriptions of how non-traditional materials are used in teaching.
• Teaching awards are highly valued as are awards for distinctive service to the University or the community.

In addition to the teaching portfolio assembled by the candidate, the record for evaluation will also include a peer teaching evaluation.

B. Scholarship

While Associate Instructors or Lecturers appointed by University Writing Program are not required to produce scholarship and present at professional conferences, it is fully in line with the University's promotion and tenure guidelines for regular faculty members that they do. Ideally, in a Research University all faculty members contribute to the production of new knowledge in a regular and on-going way, which in turn, enhances their teaching. This might be true of University Writing Program teaching personnel, including Lecturers. This material may be included in the review package but is not specifically required, and is supplemental to the central teaching review that will be done of University Writing Program course instructors.

The University Writing Program Lecturer or Associate Instructor should submit annually an updated curriculum vitae that summarizes their latest teaching, creative and scholarly activities: classes taught or new classes or programs developed, books, articles, essays or chapters in books published; presentations at conferences; and other types of more informal scholarly activities such as book reviews, popular publications or presentations, or participation on boards of directors.

C. Citizenship

Service is a requirement of University Writing Program teaching personnel, and the review will consider the expression of commitment and contribution to the University Writing Program Community that goes beyond the classroom. Attendance at University Writing Program events
such as sponsored conferences, lectures, workshops, and similar events demonstrates an interest in the University Writing Program and its many members rather than only the students in a single class, and will be considered as evidence of citizenship. Teaching or service in outreach programs such as pipeline programs, community workshops or community engaged research are highly valued and should be included as part of the review packet. Programs to increase accessibility to students in the forms of advising, counseling, and writing letters of recommendation should also be presented in the review portfolio, and again are a reflection of the teacher’s commitment to and involvement in the University Writing Program community.
May 17, 2013

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in support of the University of Utah’s proposed new department in Rhetoric and Writing. At USU, we are not offering a similar focus on rhetoric in any of our undergraduate emphases, so this new department at the U of U would provide different offerings from those we make available to students in Technical and Professional Writing at USU. If you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Jeannie B. Thomas
Department Head
Professor of English and Folklore
July 17, 2013

Dear Professor Mathison,

The Department of English & Literature at Utah Valley University supports the proposal to transition the University Writing Program (UWP) to a Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies. This new department will better serve U of U students, U of U faculty, community stakeholders, as well as faculty and students at other Utah schools. At UVU, we appreciate the leadership the U of U provides in the field of Writing and Rhetoric Studies.

U of U Students

The UWP transition to department status will further enhance their proposed undergraduate Writing Major to allow specific focus on multiple aspects of writing. Rather than a more traditional literary studies degree (English major), the new Writing major, according to the proposal, will allow concentrated work in Rhetorical History and Theory, Social Practices, Multimodal Competency, Writing Competency, and Information Literacy. The proposal further indicates that this department would be the first of its kind among PAC 12 institutions, so it is clear that although similar departments flourish at many schools across the country, undergraduate students in this region currently have little opportunity to focus their education exclusively on the burgeoning field of Rhetoric and Writing Studies. The new department and associated undergraduate major will thus better prepare students for numerous job opportunities, and for advanced degrees in both this field and many other professional degree programs.

We note that at the U of U, writing education is supervised campus-wide by a Writing Board that represents a number of disciplines and Colleges. Because the U of U 2003 Review process recommended that the UWP functioned as a department and therefore should transition to become one, it seems clear that department status will continue to provide leadership for writing across the curriculum at our school and others.

U of U Faculty

The faculty who teach coursework for the UWP will be best served by grouping them in a Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies. Because this Department would lead the way among PAC 12 institutions, the reputation and status of the U of U faculty and graduates will be enhanced. Further, we admire the opportunity that faculty in this new department will enjoy in aligning their research interests. Bringing together the expertise of diverse faculty within the new department likely will bring about additional research and grant opportunities.

The U of U currently employs 8 Lecturers, 5 Associate Faculty, and only 2 adjunct faculty. Because most of the writing courses at the U of U are therefore taught by permanent, full-time faculty, students benefit in terms of consistent instruction and dedicated faculty attention. In addition, Lecturers are rewarded with rank distinctions which encourage superior teaching and related research achievement. Unfortunately, a majority of writing courses at other Utah schools, including UVU, are taught by a rotating pool of adjunct faculty, who, to make a living wage, are likely to become "freeway flyers," often teaching sections at three or more schools across the state, travelling long-distances and scrambling each semester to adjust to changing needs and schedules. The U of U model could become the standard for institutions of higher learning that have a stake in academic and workplace literacy.
Community Stakeholders

At UVU, we prize engaged learning that involves students in projects outside the classroom. We see the proposed Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies as a nexus for such engaged learning, as it devotes specific attention to student internships and job-related preparation. At a time when industry is clamoring for better writing skills from college graduates, it seems a wise investment to elevate the study of writing to departmental status.

Writing and Rhetoric Studies as a field of inquiry is deeply invested in researching and developing new modes of education that reflect our digital world and innovatively connect with community partners. In a July 2013 article in The Chronicle of Higher Education, Clay Shirky points out that “MOOCs are not the future of higher education—that future will be far more various and surprising than we can see now—but they do expand the horizon of the visible. One of the things we can see in that expanded landscape is that the demand for complex knowledge far outstrips our ability to provide it via current colleges and universities.” The proposed department aligns faculty and students in developing rigorous new modes of education that directly link to the marketplace and respond to financial realities.

Faculty at Utah Universities and Colleges

Curriculum offered by the proposed department offers exciting possibilities for our own Writing Studies program, such as courses in Writing and the Public Sphere, Business Plans and Proposals, Writing Across Borders, Digital Rhetoric, Language of the Law, Rhetorics of Gender, and Digital Research Methods.

The UWP houses a Ph.D. in Rhetoric & Composition with a cutting-edge curriculum and reputation. The proposed department will further add to the status of the Ph.D. program both nationally and internationally because it mirrors the direction and trajectory of the larger academic field. Graduates of the Ph.D. program hold UVU leadership positions, including Dr. Deborah Marrott, Chair of Basic Composition, Dr. Gae Lyn Henderson, Writing Program Administrator, and, formerly WPA, Dr. Doug Downs. In addition, other UVU faculty have benefitted from UWP coursework, such as Dr. Janet Colvin, Chair of Communication. UVU also employs numerous adjunct faculty in our Writing Program and in Basic Composition who have been educated by the UWP. We support the proposed department as a superior training opportunity for potential faculty.

Stand-alone Writing Programs such as exist at the University of Utah have enjoyed widespread support from faculty in fields of Rhetoric & Composition, Writing Studies, Critical Discourse Analysis, Literacy, English, Communication, English as a Second Language, and Education/Culture/Society. Each of these fields, and a number of others, employ faculty dedicated to the various aspects of English language learning and literacy, but all share in common a dedicated central concern with writing. The existing UWP models the importance of writing as a research subject for all Utah schools. For example, the May, 2012 Conference on Critical Discourse Analysis held at the University of Utah and initiated by U of U faculty Dr. Thomas Huckin and Dr. Jennifer Andrus invited scholars from across the United States to participate in the first-ever US CDA Conference. The emerging field of CDA in European countries thus found an American counterpart with the inception of this important conference. We are aware of a scholarly book collection currently under review that includes submissions from two Conference presenters. Leadership provided by UWP thus initiates research and publishing opportunities for faculty at Utah schools and across the country.

The Department of English & Literature at Utah Valley University supports the proposal to transition the University Writing Program (UWP) to a Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies.
Sincerely,

Steve

Stephen D. Gibson
Chair, Department of English
Utah Valley University
June 24, 2013

Dr. Maureen Mathison
University Writing Program
255 Central Campus Dr., RM 3700
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Dear Dr. Mathison,

I am pleased to support the proposal to create a Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies at the University of Utah. This will offer important new opportunities for undergraduate students in a variety of fields.

This proposal presents clear evidence of sufficient student interest in this department. The proposal answers all the important questions about curriculum, faculty, course offerings and possible areas of emphasis designed to prepare students for graduate school and employment.

The University Writing Program was established in 1983. In the past 30 years is has provided a strong curriculum in writing-across-the-curriculum, undergraduate writing courses and teacher training. In addition the UWP has expanded its outreach both on campus and in the community.

I am particularly interested in the various options for specialization: Pre-Law, Professional Writing, Gender Studies, International, Rhetoric, Business and Biology/Pre-Med. This provides a wide range of course groupings and should attract students.

Another strong point of this proposal is the discussion of faculty. Some have indicated their preference to stay in their respective departments where they are tenured, but others are willing to move to the new department. It is important that faculty have the autonomy of making that decision.

The proposal to create a new department builds on the well-established success of the UWP. In addition, the new department will not compete with existing programs in the state.
Please add my name to the list of supporters of this proposal to create a Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kathleen M. Herndon, Ed.D.
Chair, English Department
October 8, 2012

Undergraduate Council
Office of Undergraduate Studies
110 Sill Center
CAMPUS

Dear Undergraduate Council,

I am pleased to write a letter to support the University Writing Program's (UWP) request for a name change to the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies. The name change reflects a national trend, whereby longstanding writing programs are being conferred departmental status.

Over the last fifty years, the discipline of writing has expanded throughout the United States, generating extensive research on writing instruction and a number of print and online journals dedicated to publishing research, all of which supports research-based undergraduate writing instruction in lower and upper division courses. Writing reached a level of disciplinary status by 2004, as stipulated by the National Research Council (NRC), and was officially acknowledged by this council in 2010. With growth in both status and numbers, it has become common for programs and faculty cohorts to carve out unique spaces in their home institutions, often seeking departmental status. Departments currently exist in a number of prominent peer institutions, including the University of Iowa, the University of Minnesota -Twincities, and the University of Texas -Austin.

The University Writing Program at the University of Utah exemplifies these positive developments in the discipline, having a well-established doctoral program, a growing minor, and quality instruction at the lower- and upper-division for general education and the baccalaureate requirement. Since its inception, the growth and development of the University Writing Program has been consistent and strong.

The UWP faculty are involved in long-term research projects in the teaching and learning of academic writing at the undergraduate and graduate levels, the Interconnections between rhetoric and digital technologies, technical writing, second language writing, legal rhetoric and political rhetoric.

Both the departments of English and of Communication support this name change. Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies curriculum will be coordinated with other departments to ensure no duplication of teaching efforts. An advisory board comprised of faculty from English and Communication will meet once a year to coordinate curriculum decisions. The proposal also calls for the reinstatement of a Writing Board for consultation about writing across campus. Members from the Sciences, Social Sciences, Humanities, Engineering, and upper campus will be invited to participate.
Changing the name of the University Writing Program to the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies requires no additional funding for teaching, faculty resources or administration. Additional resources for student advising will be provided.

I am pleased to recommend approval of this change.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert D. Newman, Dean
College of Humanities

RN/jd

Cc  Maureen Mathison, Director
October 5, 2012

To Whom It May Concern,

The English Department fully supports the proposal for the University Writing Program (UWP) status and name change to the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies. The UWP has been an autonomous academic unit since the 1980s; it has come to be noted nationally for its high quality faculty members and innovative curriculum. Essentially, the UWP has functioned as an independent department for more than a decade.

Professor Mathison, Director of the UWP, met with the English faculty last spring to discuss the proposed change and a new major in Writing and Rhetoric Studies. There was unanimous agreement to support departmental status and the major.

The UWP and the English Department have a strong relationship. The UWP offers TA teacher training and funding for many of our graduate students; several of our undergraduate students are pursuing a minor through the UWP. We look forward to continuing our collaboration with the new department.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Barry Weller, Chair
October 5, 2012

To Whom It May Concern,

The Department of Communication offers its support for the proposed name and status change of the University Writing Program (UWP) to the Department of Writing and Rhetoric Studies. It also supports the proposed major.

Faculty members in the Department of Communication discussed the two proposals with Professor Mathison, Director of the University Writing Program, at a faculty meeting last spring. The consensus was that over the years the UWP has developed a unique curriculum from which students benefit by gaining a deeper knowledge and command of writing practice and theory. The number of students in the UWP minor has increased; we anticipate genuine student interest in the major.

The Department of Communication and the University Writing Program have a lengthy history based on a positive relationship. We look forward to continuing and growing our collaboration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Kent Ono
Professor and Chair
October 1st, 2012

To Whom It May Concern:

On behalf of the University of Utah’s Department of Education, Culture and Society (ECS), it is with great enthusiasm that I write this letter of support for the Writing Program’s application requesting departmental status. The ECS faculty believes that the Writing Program’s elevation to a department would greatly benefit the University of Utah community. The Program’s offerings are unique and will continue to be in great demand by students.

The ECS Department looks forward to the addition of the University of Utah’s Writing Department.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ed Buendía
Professor Maureen Mathison  
University Writing Program  
255 Central Campus Drive Room 3770  
Campus  

April 8, 2013  

Dear Professor Mathison,  

Proposal for a Department of Writing and Rhetoric  

I am writing to support your request that the University Writing Program be given the status of an academic department.  

Based on the proposal you have sent me, I am convinced that a Department of Writing and Rhetoric will be an asset to the university’s curriculum at both the undergraduate and graduate level. You have shown that the University Writing Program is well-established at the U, and has experienced sustained growth since 1983. Faculty support is in place, the curriculum is set, and student body interest and demand appears sufficient to justify this request. The five-year budget projection appears reasonable, and the impact on the budgets of other departments in the college is minimal.  

It is significant that writing and rhetoric is broadly recognized as an academic field in higher education and that a number of top tier universities already have departments in this field. It is also interesting to note that this would be the first such department in a PAC-12 institution. I am glad to learn that the University of Utah has the library resources to sustain research and teaching in this field. As a historian, this does not surprise me. Although the field as an area of modern scholarship has developed since the 1960s, the fields of writing and rhetoric have a long history in higher education. The greatest thinkers of the ancient world were educated in these fields. Origen was a grammarian; Augustine was a rhetorician. So this is not a new discipline – indeed, as a field of study it is intrinsic to the goals of higher education.  

The new writing and rhetoric major promises an excellent disciplinary fit for History students. Training in the academic field of writing and rhetoric would be important to all historical fields including the history of gender, ethnicity, imperial and colonial history. I can imagine that now that a writing and rhetoric major has been approved, a History/ Writing and Rhetoric double major will be appealing for our students.
I wish you every success in achieving departmental status and look forward to interdisciplinary contact between our departments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Isabel Moreira  
Professor and Chair  
Department of History  
1-5685
Maureen Mathison, Associate Professor
Director, University Writing Program
Room 3700
Language and Communication Building
255 S. Central Campus Drive
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

April 9, 2012

Dear Professor Mathison,

The University of Utah Libraries appreciate your request to comment on our ability to support students in a new Rhetoric and Writing Studies undergraduate major as they develop programs needed by our students.

As the curriculum will comprise largely of existing University Writing Program courses, current collections should be sufficient. The J. Willard Marriott Library has extensive holdings in Rhetoric and Writing Studies including monographs, databases and online journals specific to the discipline. These holdings have been acquired over many years to support the Department of English, the Department of Communication, Classics and the College of Education. Rhetoric and Writing Studies is so interdiscipliary in nature that the library already has significant coverage in the discipline. Our collection is sufficiently large and deep to satisfy most undergraduate needs. In addition, Marriott has an approval plan which automatically provides major English language scholarly books.

Marriott also has significant resources to support the multimodal and multimedia communication projects that many students in the new major will be undertaking. Students may take advantage of the hundreds of software packages available in the Knowledge Commons and the expertise and equipment offered in the Commons and the Digital Scholarship Lab.

We encourage faculty to work with subject librarians to build up specific sub-disciplines where our collection needs supplementing. Despite budget constraints, we are usually able to order any books necessary to directly support classes. We modify our journal subscriptions to reflect current teaching and research. As the scholarly communication landscape evolves, new options may exist beyond traditional print book purchases and conventional subscriptions. We would like to work with faculty to evaluate the most workable.
Thanks to the state-wide funding received by the Utah Academic Library Consortium (UALC) and to campus Student Computing Task Force funds, our electronic collection is strong in indexes, abstracts, and full-text online databases.

Student difficulties in locating materials often stem not from collection weaknesses, but from the complexities of using a large research library. We offer class presentations and one-to-one consultations with library specialists who will help students find the most relevant works and suggest the most appropriate search strategies. Once the major is approved, we will appoint a subject liaison to work directly with faculty in providing training and consultation for students as well as collection development assistance.

We look forward to working with the faculty and students in this new program.

Yours truly,

Rick Anderson  
Acting Dean  
J. Willard Marriott Library

Catherine Soehner  
Associate Dean, Research and Learning  
J. Willard Marriott Library
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University of Utah
Master of Music — String Performance & Pedagogy (new emphasis)
08/15/2013

Section I: Request

This is a request to create a new emphasis in String Performance & Pedagogy within the existing Master of Music degree. The University of Utah has offered significant graduate instruction in string performance and string music education for many years. This good work provides preparation for a large component of professional musicians who perform and/or teach in public or private schools. However, there is currently no specialized course of study for emerging professionals whose work focuses on private studio teaching. A degree program (a graduate emphasis) in Performance & Pedagogy is the normal vehical for delivering that professional preparation. This proposal builds on the substantial graduate program in music already in place at the University of Utah.

This request is a direct product of robust faculty governance. Individual members of the string faculty of the School of Music initially developed the idea for the program. That notion was then discussed, modified, and approved by the Graduate Studies Committee of the School of Music (a standing committee of the music faculty). The proposal then came to all of the voting members of the faculty of the School of Music. Faculty approval of this proposal is enthusiastically endorsed by the administration of the School of Music.

Section II: Need

As alluded to above, a significant percentage of professional string musicians make a large component of their salaries by private studio teaching. Existing programs in string performance and in string music education create important value for the state of Utah, but appropriate preparation for private studio teaching is dormant. Students in Utah do not have access to this kind of degree. Institutions in Colorado and Arizona provide the closest programs with strong development. This proposed additional graduate emphasis will allow balanced preparation of emerging professionals to serve the people of Utah.

The proposal for a Master of Music in String Performance and Pedagogy is in response to a growing demand for trained music teachers and musicians in the intermountain west. The vocational focus of this program will prepare our students to become actively involved in the community in teaching and training young musicians. This will contribute to the important goal of citizens obtaining access to higher education as there are no other universities in Utah that offer a degree in Pedagogy for strings.

The University of Utah is uniquely equipped to provide this instruction to the people of Utah with a high level of achievement outcomes. The level of our advanced degree programs in Music, our urban location near the largest number of citizens of any four-year public institution, and our unique integration with professional music in Utah provides students with the most significant opportunity for positive outcomes.
Section III: Institutional Impact

The proposed program will reinforce existing curricula and will result in a small increase in the number of students who remain in Utah for graduate study, rather than move to states where this kind of Performance & Pedagogy program is already present. In addition, it is anticipated that some of the current students who are registered for the existing string performance or the string music education degrees will shift into this program as a more appropriate professional preparation.

No change in administrative structure is envisioned from the success of this proposal.

The affect of the proposal on faculty loads is minimal. The principal means of meeting the increase in instructional workload in upper strings (violin and viola, the primary point of implementation) is anticipated to be through additional excellent adjunct faculty members (new persons or increased load for current part-time persons). The university’s location in the urban heart of Utah provides an ideal real-world context for graduate students. The professionals who are drawn to teach in the School of Music in an adjunct capacity add significant artistic and scholarly value to the program.

No significant equipment or alterations of facilities are engendered by this solitary proposal for a new emphasis at the master’s level.

Section IV: Finances

No new costs (or savings) are garnered from the implementation of this proposed new emphasis to existing master’s degree programs. It is understood that general costs of the music program increase with any form of growth, but those costs are not differentiated in a meaningful way by type of degree program. Very modest overall growth in the numbers of music major students (undergraduate, master’s-level, and doctoral-level) is anticipated as reflective of general population increases in Utah and the rising positive visibility and vitality of the music program and the university. General tuition and fee revenues tracked to the university are anticipated to be adequate to meet the modest adjustments engendered by this program.

Section V: Program Curriculum

***THIS SECTION OF THE TEMPLATE REQUIRED FOR EMPHASES, MINORS, AND CERTIFICATES ONLY***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Prefix and Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses Required of MM Students in every emphasis (11 hours)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 6010</td>
<td>Music Bibliography</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 66x0 or 680x</td>
<td>Music History/Literature Course</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 6550, 6520, or 7510</td>
<td>Music Theory Course</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of additional History or Theory</td>
<td>Additional History or Theory Course</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>String Pedagogy, Literature, &amp; Performance Studies (23–26 credits)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 6830</td>
<td>Survey of String Pedagogy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 6840</td>
<td>String Literature</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 6841</td>
<td>Advanced String Pedagogy I</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 6842</td>
<td>Advanced String Pedagogy II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Prefix and Number</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 6190</td>
<td>Advanced Private Lessons (3 or 4 semesters)</td>
<td>9–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 6440 or 6445</td>
<td>Campus Symphony or Utah Philharmonia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 6430</td>
<td>Chamber Music (2 semesters)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 6920</td>
<td>Master’s Performance I (Recital)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 6930</td>
<td>Master’s Performance II (Solo or Chamber Music Recital)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Capstone String Pedagogy Project (1 hr)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSC 6843</td>
<td>String Pedagogy Project</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>35–38</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Elective Courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Track/Options (if applicable)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Number of Credits</strong></td>
<td><strong>35–38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Program Schedule**

**Fall of First Year — 11 hours credit**
- MUSC 6010 Music Bibliography (2 credits)
- MUSC 66x0 or 680x Music History/Literature Class (3)
- MUSC 6830 Survey of String Pedagogy (2)
- MUSC 6190 Applied Music: Private Lessons (3)
- MUSC 6445 Utah Philharmonia (1)

**Spring of First Year — 11 hours credit**
- MUSC 65x0 Music Theory Class (3)
- MUSC 6840 String Literature (2)
- **MUSC 6841 Advanced String Pedagogy I (2)**
- MUSC 6190 Applied Music: Private Lessons (3)
- MUSC 6445 Utah Philharmonia (1)

**Fall of Second Year — 10 hours credit**
- MUSC 66x0, 680x or 65x0 Choice of Additional Music History or Theory Class (3)
- **MUSC 6842 Advanced String Pedagogy II (2)**
- MUSC 6190 Applied Music: Private Lessons (3)
- MUSC 6430 Chamber Music (1)
- MUSC 6920 Master’s Performance I (1)

**Spring of Second Year — 6 hours credit**
- **MUSC 6843 String Pedagogy Project (1)**
  [MUSC 6190 Applied Music: Private Lessons (3) — optional]
- MUSC 6430 Chamber Music (1)
- MUSC 6930 Master’s Performance II (solo or chamber music recital: 1 hour credit)
Date: August 27, 2013

To: Ed Barbanell, Associate Dean
    Undergraduate Studies

From: Raymond Tymas-Jones, Dean
      College of Fine Arts

Subject: Support for the Master of Music—String Performance & Pedagogy Emphasis

This memorandum is in support of the Master of Music—String Performance & Pedagogy Emphasis. This proposal has received support from the faculty, Department Chair, and College Curriculum Committee; I now add my support as well. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. Thank you for your consideration and assistance.
Honors and Awards to Members of the University Community

1. The University’s Shoshoni Language Project was recently awarded the 2013 William Demmert Cultural Freedom Award by the National Indian Education Association. The project, which began in 2004, works in collaboration with tribes to document and preserve the language through various research and outreach activities. Since its incorporation in 1970, the National Indian Education Association has served as the convening organization for stakeholders who work with American Indian youths. The association named their prestigious award after William Demmert who was an outstanding educational leader and researcher that promoted the inclusion of indigenous culture and language in the school curriculum, both in the U.S. and abroad.

2. Two professors have received a combined $4 million in grants from the U.S. Department of Energy to find better ways to work with metals. Zhigang Zak Fang, professor of metallurgical engineering, will receive a $3 million grant to find a cheaper, more energy-efficient way to manufacture lightweight, corrosion-resistant titanium. Using such metal would make vehicles more fuel-efficient, but currently costs 10 times more than steel to manufacture. The new method would use magnesium hydride to extract titanium from ore. Raj Rajamani, also a professor of metallurgical engineering, will get $1 million to develop a new electromagnetic way to sort lightweight scrap metals. Current methods can’t distinguish between different grades of metal alloys, but the new method could reduce the need for manufacturing new metals.

3. Holli Martinez, nurse practitioner and director of the University hospital’s palliative-care team, recently received a $50,000 palliative-care award as one of five recipients of the Cambia Health Foundation’s Sojourns Award this year. Palliative care, which sprouted from the hospice movement, is a growing medical specialty in Utah and across the nation. Martinez, the fourth straight winner from Utah, will use the money to improve palliative care at the hospital. She was selected because of her efforts to advance palliative care in the state. Those efforts included developing a directory which helps patients pick hospices based on their needs and training to guide intensive-care doctors and nurses about when to call in the palliative-care team.

4. Miriah Meyer, assistant professor with the Scientific Computing and Imaging Institute, has been chosen as a 2013 PopTech Science Fellow. PopTech’s Fellows programs aims to accelerate the impact of emerging innovators and scientists, who are working to solve some of the world’s most pressing challenges. Professor Meyer is being recognized for her work in the development of visualization systems that support exploratory, complex data analysis tasks and help scientists make sense of complex data.

5. The Society for Neuroscience has awarded the inaugural Nemko Prize to Shigeki Watanabe, postdoctoral fellow in biology. This new prize acknowledges the achievements of a young scientist in recognition of an outstanding Ph.D. thesis advancing understanding of molecular, genetic or cellular mechanisms underlying brain function. Shigeki works in the laboratory of Erik Jorgensen, a distinguished professor of biology. He currently studies how nerve cell vesicles -- tiny bubbles that contain neurotransmitter chemicals -- are recycled after they help send a nerve signal from one nerve cell to the next.
6. Pam Perlich, senior research economist with the David Eccles School of Business, recently received an outstanding achievement award from the YWCA at their annual leadership luncheon. The awards are given annually to women who have made exceptional contributions in reducing racism and empowering women. Perlich exemplifies that through her efforts to “democratize data” via the Utah Community Data Project at the David Eccles School of Business's Bureau of Economic and Business Research. Through her work at BEBR, Pam has established herself as the state’s leading demographer, with special emphasis on minority populations, immigration, and the demographics of education.

7. Ivan Sudakov, research assistant professor in the department of Mathematics, won a 2013 Green Talents award for outstanding potential in sustainability research. Sudakov, who studies the mathematics linking sea ice and climate, is a Russian native who joined the University in 2012, is among 25 winners of the honor, which is bestowed by Germany’s Federal Ministry of Education and Research. “The Green Talents jury was particularly impressed by Sudakov’s scientific record so far, and his strong commitment to interdisciplinary interaction between mathematics and climate science,” according to the German ministry. “By improving projections, his research offers important contributions to our understanding of the climatological and ecological role of sea ice in the climate system.”
MEMORANDUM

DATE: November 18, 2013

TO: Ruth V. Watkins
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

FROM: Janet Lindsley, Chair
University Teaching Committee

RE: Recommendation for the 2014 University Distinguished Teaching Awards

The University Teaching Committee met on November 15, 2013, to select the recipients for the 2014 University Distinguished Teaching Awards. Upon careful consideration and evaluation of the nine candidates, the University Teaching Committee strongly recommends the following four to be the recipients for the 2014 Distinguished Teaching Award:

Vincent Cheng            Professor, English
Joel Harris              Distinguished Professor, Chemistry
Christine Jones          Associate Professor, Languages & Literature
Jeff Metcalf             Associate Professor (Lecturer), English

Upon approval, please forward the candidates of the Distinguished Teaching Award to the Academic Senate and the Board of Trustees for approval.

Thank you.

Approved: ________________ 11-18-13

Ruth V. Watkins
Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs