

I don't want to take a lot of your time by ^{my} report. I've already taken nearly 7 years
I'm very happy to be here ^{finally} today by what I consider a
very strong proposal for a program in WAC.

I'd like to offer ~~both~~ a brief report ~~and a proposal~~ today.

First, let me note that when I first came to the Senate in 1986 requesting permission to begin planning a program in WAC, I represented roughly 14 faculty members from the Writing Center Steering Committee.

Since then, this proposal has not only grown in popularity among faculty and administrators, it has also grown in authors. This document before you is truly an instance of writing across the curriculum since it represents the best thinking of literally hundreds of faculty and administrators in the university.

~~Since our first efforts, numerous changes have occurred on campus. We have had two chancellors, three inhabitants of the Vice Chancellor's office, two deans in the College of Arts and Sciences, and three chairs in the Department of English. As a result, we have truly carried this proposal through a wilderness of sorts to place it before you here today.~~

One of the major problems I have faced in that there is no direct route in the university for the development of programs from the bottom up, that is beginning with concerned faculty. But as an example of that kind of program, the development of this proposal passed through five different and easily distinguishable stages.

The first stage involved identification of the problem and survey of interest. We researched the writing of our graduates on the job, listened to professors across the campus as they complained about student writing, and came to the Senate with the goal of devising a program that would solve some of our students' writing problems. We surveyed faculty and students to determine if there was interest in developing such a program and found, indeed, considerable interest.

The second stage involved researching various potential solutions to the problems of student writing. We conducted research in faculty members' classrooms, read and summarized published literature, brought in a consultant from Michigan Tech University, and contacted faculty at universities similar to our own to see how they have developed and continued programs in writing across the curriculum.

The third stage brought us back to the Senate for the April 1989 meeting, where faculty unanimously passed several resolutions which we have used as guidelines in writing and developing this proposal.

The fourth stage involved us in debate over the specific elements of the program. The Committee on Writing Across the Curriculum met in an open meeting with members of the University Curriculum Committee, University Credits Committee, Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee, and General Education Committee. The chief result was an improved proposal better representing the concerns of university faculty.

The fifth stage involved revision of the proposal into something close to its current form. This proposal was sent simultaneously to deans and department chairs throughout the university. It has also

Lat

Bizzaro

been reviewed by various university committees. The result again was revision to better accomodate the wishes of faculty and administrators in the university.

The proposal before you represents the best thinking possible by hundreds of faculty and administrators in the university. It has been endorsed by the University Curriculum Committee, the University Admissions and Recruitment Committee, the University General Education Committee, the Council for Teacher Education, and the Freshman Composition Committee.

It has been approved by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Chairs of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Approval has also been given by the Dean of the School of Education, Dean of the School of Nursing, Dean of the School of Human Environmental Sciences, and the Dean of the School of Business, all of whom have consulted with their faculty.