
administrative work by criteria for other roles. But the role of the WPA is different from a traditional faculty role—there are different stakeholders, different kinds of decisions, different parties with whom to negotiate. I question whether this document can solve the problems it is intended to address.

Whose Work?

Suellynn Duffey

My story falls outside the realm of “Evaluating the Intellectual Work of Writing Program Administrators,” and yet I am a WPA and have been for a dozen years (and more). Can the document be revised to include me? For it influences me, implicitly. It argues that curricular and program development are scholarly work, but who owns the work? Even if my story is unique (which I doubt), I hope you will agree that it merits consideration. For ten years I administered writing programs at a Carnegie Research I university with a first-class graduate program in composition and rhetoric. Now at another large public university, I focus on writing across the curriculum.

At my previous institution, I adapted a basic writing and reading program from the University of Pittsburgh. A stimulating teaching and scholarly culture emerged so that graduate students began to gravitate to the program, stay there as teachers, and conduct career-building research under my guidance and that of others. We created internal curricular documents, often received requests for these documents from other institutions, and were visited by WPAs wanting to investigate innovative programs. We began studies of literacy in basic writing classes, in graduate classes, and elsewhere.

We paired honors and basic writing classes to investigate alternatives to English placement systems. Springing from a desire to deliver excellent writing instruction to all students equally, this project investigated the known effects of tracking students. It worked within the local institutional structure to open boundaries that segregated groups of students; it used teams of teachers and ethnographic researchers to document results; and it formed the basis for scholarly presentations and articles (mine and others’). Under my leadership and a collaborative management style, this basic writing program received national recognition. All these, plus my efforts since, have resulted in written evidence of my curricular, pedagogical, and scholarly work (publications, internal documents, grant proposals, program descriptions and training materials with philosophical and pedagogical grounding).

Partly as a result of the success of the program, I was asked to take on a bigger operation. Charged to reform the core curriculum, to enhance graduate student preparation, and to bring coherence to an array of first-year writing

programs, I leaped in to administer the reform. Working on those projects for a much shorter time (two and a half years versus eight) did not allow all the changes I initiated to mature fully. Still, many were solidly in place and growing when I changed institutions: I established peer teaching groups and a development program for peer mentors. I trained well over a hundred new graduate students to teach the core curriculum and involved a quarter of them in curricular revision projects (some of which have resulted in collaborative conference presentations and a potential publication). With graduate students, I developed the reader and teaching apparatus to accompany the course and in the program's second year worked with a publisher to produce it.

The results and nature of this program development and the trajectory of my professional life are the reasons I write now. Perhaps if our field, if our colleagues in the field, and ultimately if our educational and publishing institutions understood the scholarly nature of program development (as I have enacted it and lived it every day for more than a decade), if they credited the intellectual work and property I and others like me generate, perhaps in this dream, I would not look with chagrin at a recent publication, a textbook that teaches the writing program I developed, a textbook with my successor's name on the cover, not my own.

The forces that lead up to this result do not present a clear case of right or wrong because they are complex. But I ask, "Am I to remain invisible because my administrative scholarship did not constitute intellectual work and property? Because my program could not travel with me when I changed institutions and now 'belongs' to my successors?"

The WPA document overlooks two separate issues of ownership. Who owns administrative property that is developed collaboratively? And who owns a curricular, administrative, and scholarly program when one leaves the institution in which she developed it? Because I did not hold a tenure-accruing position I could, according to one legal opinion, lay claim to none of my work (as a faculty member could). Instead, my intellectual contributions belonged to the university that employed me. Thus, my story as a WPA adds peculiar twists to the issues the WPA document tries to address.

The WPA: A Reconsideration, a Redefinition

Theresa Enos

Because administrative duties—often heavy duties—come with the job in composition and rhetoric, I would like to see the role of Writing Program Administrators expanded in the WPA draft document, "Evaluating the Intellectual Work of Writing Program Administrators." This document's main argument, based on the Portland Resolution defining the intellectual work of WPAs,