

A Greenhouse for Writing Program Change

Laura Brady

In the fall of 1998, the provost at my institution invited the English department to take part in a “greenhouse project.” He used a greenhouse metaphor to encourage the department to deliver a strategic plan for its own future within a six-month window. The provost then promised to support viable proposals and to provide seed money to begin the changes. Seven years later, it is clear that the seeds germinated in that greenhouse are bearing fruit for our writing programs, and I hope to show here how other writing programs might use a greenhouse model to initiate or accelerate long-term program planning. Specifically, I offer our local experience as an example of ways the model helped our department accomplish the following goals: to reexamine established ways of working, initiate strategic change, maintain strategic change as a dynamic condition of writing program administration, and fund strategic change.

REEXAMINING ESTABLISHED WAYS OF WORKING

The idea for the provost’s greenhouse project is similar to the corporate “action lab” model of change (Pascale and Miller 64). The action lab model assumes that focused attention over a short time period helps foster an intense environment in which no participant is quite sure what conventions apply. In initial conversations, participants do not feel comfortable—but that is part of the point, since traditional patterns of authority and interaction are often part of what impedes change.

The focus on accelerated experimentation and change in a greenhouse model intends to overcome the inertia created by habit and tradition, elements that so often prevent new growth. To initiate such a program, a greenhouse experiment requires

- an initial challenge that is broad enough to leave the outcomes open to discussion,
- a specific and limited time frame for a report (e.g., six months or less in an academic setting),
- a collective agreement from participants that they are willing to try the experiment and explore new ideas, and
- a commitment from higher administration to support the outcomes of the experiment, whether the greenhouse produces a plan for change or a return to established patterns.

In addition, while a greenhouse or action lab model can be initiated at the program, department, college, or university level, it eventually depends on upper-level support of changes or continuity; the upper-level support fosters a certain security to balance out other risks. While not absolutely essential, an ideal model also includes some financial support for the process, such as short-term funding for a departmental retreat or established start-up funds to launch initiatives that might result from the greenhouse. (It goes with the academic territory that many changes, however, can be initiated within the limits of existing resources.)

CREATING CHANGE: BUILDING THE GREENHOUSE

Building a greenhouse does not need to be expensive or time-consuming. [. . .] The final choice of the type of greenhouse will depend on the growing space desired, home architecture, available sites, and costs. The greenhouse must, however, provide the proper environment.

—David S. Ross

Even if a greenhouse for programmatic change is a figurative rather than physical space, the advice from David Ross's planning guide remains relevant: the greenhouse process does not need to be expensive or time consuming. The greenhouse process is, however, time intensive. Instead of meeting once a month for two hours for the entire academic year (a total eighteen hours of meetings), our department accelerated and consolidated the process into three six-hour meetings. This acceleration necessitated several adjustments. First we had to secure faculty time when everyone was available for two or three day-long meetings, which we did by agreeing to meet before the semester began and by canceling a day of classes. Then we had to find a meeting space large enough for break-out groups and full faculty discussion.

Next, we gathered some basic materials such as flip charts, and, finally, we planned to provide food to make it possible for people to work in the same space all day.

The greenhouse meetings were long, but we made significant progress at each—consistent with the greenhouse idea of accelerated growth. At the first meeting, we identified strengths, needs, and goals. At the second meeting, we established priorities and strategies for meeting our goals. At the third meeting, we hammered out a draft of the proposal we would submit to the provost and dean. In addition, we found we needed some short follow-up sessions.

If departments have funds available, they might consider hiring facilitators—those who come highly recommended and who understand the academic (rather than corporate) context. In our case, however, we would have done better without facilitators. The facilitators, recommended and funded by the provost's office with the intent of helping us adjust to this new model of accelerated discussions, were simply not a good fit for the context. As one colleague put it, "Never hire corporate facilitators who use evangelical models to convince academics of anything. When you explain to them that peer pressure doesn't work with people who value non-conformity, they don't believe you." The facilitators were also not prepared to operate at the level of complexity that academics use to evaluate their circumstances; the facilitators' unfamiliarity with academic culture created several difficulties for the facilitators. They didn't comprehend how demands of publication, tenure, teaching, and service all contribute to a department's goals and identity. It is possible that even poor facilitators can strengthen a community by inspiring a certain collective resistance, but I do not recommend that route. Instead, hired facilitators (or colleagues who have been asked to serve as a steering committee for the accelerated meeting process) should help keep the process focused and on time and to synthesize ideas as participants draft a strategic plan.

Each institution should develop its own process. Based on what we learned from our department's experience in 1999 and from similar subsequent processes for university-wide accreditation and strategic planning committees, clear steps evolved for the greenhouse model as it is now practiced at our institution (see appendix). The system that worked for our fairly large but congenial department (30 or more members) at a public institution may not work the same way among a more contentious group; likewise, at a small school where colleagues have occasions to chat with each other often and informally, there might be little need for the intense meeting schedule that typifies the accelerated greenhouse environment.

The value of the greenhouse model lies in its potential to germinate ideas. That germination process can occur in a variety of ways, as long as faculty members agree to explore a wide range of ideas, reach consensus, and act collectively in achieving change. In our case, the greenhouse discussions clarified the importance we as a department gave to the writing process and to written texts. This recognition helped us collectively to examine the various writing-centered activities that already existed in the department. We began to discuss questions such as:

- What portion of our FTE and student credit hours depends on writing classes?
- How much do the people who teach writing contribute to departmental decisions?
- How might a new emphasis on writing affect future hiring decisions (especially at a moment when we can no longer assume replacement of lines as faculty retire or resign)?
- How might a new emphasis on writing-program development contribute to the department (especially as our institution asks us to examine how scholarly research and productivity balance with student credit hours and FTE, program enrollments, and placement rates for undergraduate and graduate majors)?

The greenhouse also drew attention to the fact that over 60 percent of our department's course offerings (and an even larger percent of student credit hours) consisted of writing courses. This surprised, to varying degrees, many of the literature faculty. Some colleagues were surprised to learn also that much of the travel budget for the entire department relied on the income generated by the sale of the course guides written by the writing faculty and graduate students. While these realities had long existed, they represented facts that many colleagues had never paused to consider. Writing had become a quiet set of "service" courses that were almost invisible in terms of their significant financial contribution to the department as a whole.

That is, prior to the greenhouse initiative, the writing program largely served the department's needs for generating student credit hours and FTE. The greenhouse, however, forced a close analysis of the role and the future of the writing program and of the scholarly and pedagogical contributions of those faculty and graduate students who worked primarily with writing as an academic pursuit. As a result, the department recognized that both faculty writing and the work of writing instructors must have a contributing stake

in the success and future growth of the department. We simply needed the protected (and accelerated) environment of the greenhouse to generate new patterns of interaction.

MAINTAINING CHANGE AS A DYNAMIC CONDITION

In an essay on curriculum revision as a reflective practice in teaching and writing program administration, E. Shelley Reid advocates change as a crucial component of any writing program's practices (21). Reid observes that "changing and its benefits are hardly new ideas to writing teachers. We recommend change to our students almost as often as we breathe. [. . .] Moreover, we frequently ask students to change their writing style or approach for the sake of becoming more flexible writers" (14). After reflecting on our profession's emphasis on change as a model of both process and progress for writing students, Reid speculates about the benefits of encouraging our colleagues and ourselves "simply to try change" (14–15).

Although Reid focuses particularly on the need for curricular change as an ongoing condition, her points are clearly applicable to program administration generally. Faculty members come and go, and institutional factors—such as budget lines, enrollment totals, and policy statements—also shift. The change that was collaborative and innovative just a few years ago quickly becomes routine; the collaboration falters. The process of changing is what keeps systems dynamic. The key, as Reid and others point out, is to keep change purposeful rather than exhaustingly unpredictable.

Change is also a key feature of writing program administration. The major changes in our program that resulted from the greenhouse experiment are no longer new. We have established a new center for writing, added several new colleagues, and developed new courses and degree programs. We now need to plan ways to keep changes occurring so that our programs continually renew themselves. While new faculty contribute to the renewal, they need to have their own stakes in the evolving programs. Doing that requires some strategic planning *and* some strategic processes.

Just as writing instructors help students become aware of different revision strategies for different purposes, so a department must develop program-change strategies to keep its revisions purposeful rather than random, substantive rather than superficial. In our department, we found that specific change strategies assume four conditions:

1. that the writing program has a sense of its existing strengths and needs;

2. that it has a sense of where it wants to be five years from now (see the section above on “Building the Greenhouse” and the appendix);
3. that its goals are consistent with department, college, and university goals; and
4. that the writing program embraces change as a dynamic condition.

Our program made some major changes based on the greenhouse initiative, but we lost some ground by failing to emphasize *continual* change. With that goal of implementing consistent strategic and dynamic change in mind, I suggest the following five strategies since different program needs call for different plans of action:

1. Changing to Improve Organization and Focus

- Create a sentence outline: How would various faculty members describe each part of the program? Does anything seem out of place?
- Create a flow chart or map of the program: What does the structure look like? Does everyone agree? Does the order make sense? What are some alternatives?
- Use a one-inch picture frame, which enables you to worry only about what you could see if you restricted your view to a one-inch frame. Anne Lamott, who develops this idea in her book *Bird by Bird: Some Instructions on Writing and Life*, explains: “I [. . .] figure out a one-inch piece of my story to tell, one small scene, one memory, one exchange” (18). Change—in writing, in administration, in life—happens moment by moment. Focus on a moment.

2. Changing to Expand and Amplify

- Scale up: imagine doubling the current program. Don’t worry about quality or logistics for the moment; for now, just imagine what you would have with twice the faculty, students, funding—twice anything or everything.
- Change perspective: try shifting the perspective from the vantage point of faculty to that of administrator, to student, to legislator, and even to donor. What does each new perspective require or emphasize in terms of roles, responsibilities, attitudes,

and needs? As with any strategy to amplify, be prepared for seeing complexities.

3. Changing to Create a New Audience
 - What would happen if you addressed a new audience? You might change from a neutral dean to a hostile dean, from an academic audience to a public audience such as legislator or donor as a reader. What other audiences might be imagined? For what purpose?
4. Changing the Program's Purpose
 - How can the purpose or mission be recast? Who has a stake in the writing program, and why? What changes might occur if any stakeholders change?
 - How might the program emphasize (or renew) research on student writing?
 - Since a writing program's purpose is often closely tied to its funding, what gets funded and why? What might be cut and why? What other possibilities exist?
5. Changing the Administrative Persona
 - What might be accomplished through a WPA's change of attitude? Lynn Z. Bloom asks writing program administrators about what makes the job fun. If the job isn't fun, she suggests a change of attitude, which includes "a willingness to be unconventional, to challenge authority, to take risks and to get into trouble—particularly when there are creative ways to get back out" (68).
 - What might be accomplished with a WPA's shift in commitments? What changes if an administrator's primary commitment is to the self? *or* to the program? to the institution? to the profession?

This list is not meant to be comprehensive but provides a few ways to help other writing program administrators (WPAs) brainstorm change strategies that reflect their own program needs and future plans.

FUNDING CHANGE

Funding will always be a critical issue in planning and maintaining change. Writing program administrators need to understand the rhetoric of budgets—and that may involve learning a new genre and a new set of conventions. As Terrell Dixon points out, “Getting additional funding is not easy. Deans, provosts, and presidents never have enough, and every department always needs more. Colleagues believe that if the chair [or WPA] were just a little bit tougher with the dean, more money would surely follow” (41). For any WPA who knows the middle ground that Dixon describes—with the administration on one side and colleagues on the other and with both sides asking the WPA to do as much as possible with very finite funds—the budget often seems to be the limiting force. Dixon suggests finding ways to augment limited funds, based on six principles, as summarized below:

1. Know why people should give to your department and frame ideas for gifts in ways that will make the donor see the benefit—especially to students.
2. Identify several colleagues who can represent the department to potential givers and who will understand the need to match donor goals with program needs.
3. Involve alumni cultivated through a newsletter or other networking.
4. Work on getting grants as well as private gifts since grants often inspire gifts.
5. Create a print representation (newsletters, brochures, websites, etc.) of the department for public accessibility.
6. Cultivate a relationship with your development office by educating these colleagues—who are usually not teaching or research faculty members—so that they can interest others in your programs. (41–42)

Dixon concludes by noting that the ways a department (or writing program) spends its money will establish future funding (43). Common sense tells us that funds need to be well managed, but experience and logical extension tell WPAs to spend funds in support of strategic goals.

A program that squanders its resources—whether those resources take the form of university funds, grants, private funds, or faculty—will lose credibility and, consequently, the program’s lines of credit. Don Bialostosky makes this point, too, underscoring the relationship between budgets, program administration, and strategic planning:

Everything you do as head [or WPA] may affect your ability to get revenue for your department [or writing program]. Your credit with the dean depends on your credibility and effectiveness in everything. [. . .] Budget allocations are really about how well you and your department [or writing program] are meeting the college’s expectations in all areas, not just about whether you are balancing the budget. (20)

Even a small deficit does not damage credibility to the degree that a lack of strategic planning does. Bialostosky cautions that the worst budgetary move a program administrator can make is to ignore strategic priorities (22). While Bialostosky is quick to note that program administrators risk their reputations as good stewards of funds if they go too far in the red without good reason and a practical plan to cover the overage, he argues that a small deficit might be forgiven if it is one that occurs while aggressively pursuing *and* achieving some larger strategic goals. He gives the example of buying out a course to allow a faculty member to complete a major book, or choosing to recruit a stellar graduate student beyond the quota set for the department (20). Small deficits such as these allow a program to pursue larger strategic goals such as developing its graduate programs or increasing its research profile. These small deficits (if done strategically and with certainty of alternative funds), might be more productive than showing a year-end surplus, which, as every seasoned WPA knows, is likely to be swept back into the college coffers or applied to next year’s budget. What matters most is the ways the program administrator’s “credibility and effectiveness in everything” align with strategic plans (Bialostosky 20).

Most WPAs know how to establish credibility through responsiveness to student and university needs, curricular and faculty development, research and publications, and through commitments to their colleagues, their institutions, and the profession. Knowing where to seek budgetary lines of credit is much more difficult. A good place to start is with the department or program budget. The biggest expense in any department or program is usually the amount devoted to salaries and benefits, while the biggest source of income is likely to be the student credit hours generated from multiple-section courses such as first-year composition. For instance, say a large English

department runs 500 courses each year with an average enrollment across all sections of 20 students per course and each course worth three credit hours. Those courses generate 30,000 student credit hours. If each student paid a resident tuition rate of only \$150 per credit hour, this hypothetical department would generate about \$4.5 million in tuition dollars. Departments do not, of course, get millions of dollars in direct revenues from their earned student credit hours; instead, those tuition dollars necessarily cover institutional expenses ranging from salaries and benefits to support services to materials and maintenance. It is, however, still useful to know what a program generates and what it costs in relation to the larger college or university budget.

To understand a department or program's income-expense ratios, start with enrollment numbers. If enrollments have recently increased, as they have at so many universities, a program is probably generating more student credit hours than in previous years. If increased enrollments (and the revenues they generate) allow departments to hire new full-time faculty, the income-expense ratio remains stable or rises in terms of faculty expenses. In a more common scenario, however, schools who need additional tuition revenues to balance budgets that have lost state and federal support ask departments to staff new sections with graduate teaching associates, adjuncts, and/or visiting professors, all of whom cost less than full-time, tenure-line faculty. Thus, for most programs using part-time instructors to cover additional sections, the income-expense ratio changes to reflect greater income and lower expenses. In an article on institutional budgets, Barry Chabot explains that knowing these data is crucial: they allow programs to weigh the consequences of an increased reliance on per-course hires and other economies (larger classes, static or reduced stipends and fee waivers for graduate students, etc.) in terms of ethical working conditions, faculty loyalty, and morale (13–14). These data also allow WPAs to discuss these problems in specific terms with deans and provosts.

Know your numbers. Have your program's enrollments increased? Increased or decreased by how much over the last one, three, or five years? Who is staffing additional sections? If your income-expense ratio is better than another department of similar size, it might help you justify hiring additional tutors or assistant administrators, or it might be the evidence you need to maintain small class sizes. It might also provide early evidence of patterns that your program wants to resist before they create adverse effects in terms of hiring practices and the teaching and learning environment. For instance, has your program established a limit on the number of course sections that should be taught by per-course hires in proportion to the number taught by full-time, tenure-line faculty members? Knowing your numbers can help establish such goals.

In addition to the large income and expense ratios related to student credit hours and salaries, knowing about other sources of revenue and expense can also be valuable. For instance, at our institution summer school and extended learning credit hours are calculated differently, with a large portion of those revenues returned directly to the department to encourage “entrepreneurial” initiatives. These internally generated funds are more flexible in their usage than the funds we receive from the college. In our institution at the moment, they help support curriculum and professional development programs. For example, one initiative issuing from the greenhouse experiment was a commitment to integrating technology, but the provost specifically hoped to see us develop online versions of our required writing courses. Our program resisted offering distance versions of these courses because most of our students fit a very traditional age profile (18–22 years of age) and live within a five-mile radius of campus. Our compromise was to design a program for the non-traditional adult learners who would benefit from instruction freed from the constraints of time and place. Adult learners represent a small but growing portion of the university’s total enrollment. While we offer only a few distance sections for adult learners each semester, the course is well-suited to this population’s needs, the students have the maturity to meet the challenges of an online curriculum, and our retention rates are high. Moreover, the revenues make the program self-sustaining. In this instance, the entrepreneurial model worked, but we made our case for limiting the distance writing offerings by emphasizing the income-expense ratios in addition to pedagogical arguments.

Most programs have other revenue sources to consider, ranging from sales of course guides that accompany required writing courses to specific endowments. If you have not identified those incomes, it is important to do so. Think strategically about whether you see opportunities to develop funds; also think strategically about where your program stands and what segments of it you are not willing to economize on. In terms of economizing, it is worth understanding your program’s costs in relation to your return on investment. Program administrators need reasons for investing in faculty but they also need strategies for how to make a persuasive case to the dean. This balance of specific program knowledge and flexible strategies is something our program continues to develop—and one of the areas that can be advanced by maintaining change as a dynamic condition.

It is clear that WPAs need to think about multi-year budget planning in relation to multi-year career plans *and* expectations for faculty. Strategic planning that includes budget and career expectations for faculty may warrant investments in pre-tenure, mid-career, or senior faculty. As a recent article in *New Directions in Higher Education* points out, “strategic plan-

ning must recognize investing in faculty as a priority of the institution, not merely an item on the cost side of the budget” (“Investing in Faculty” 55). Ways to measure long-term return on faculty investments include continuity and growth, and they often depend on retaining strong faculty members. In turn, national recognition of quality programs increases the institution’s visibility and reputation. Such visibility attracts and retains present and future faculty and students while also attracting support from alumni, foundations, extramural funding agencies, and others (56).

Whether a WPA is looking at ways to augment limited funds or analyzing income-expense ratios and investment returns, all funding issues are based on the common theme of strategic planning. Universities need to have (and usually do have) a long term plan, and programs need to understand how they contribute to that long term plan. What income-expense ratios currently exist? How do these compare to other units, and how do they fit with strategic goals? What are the department, college, and university expectations for teaching, research, and service for the program? Are they realistic? What takes priority? Are priorities supported with salary? What other types of investments are possible (such as teaching loads, mentoring opportunities, internal grants or endowments, travel funds, classrooms, offices, technology, etc.)? What programs are (or should be) most visible?

That list of administrative questions is long because the process of strategic planning is complex and ongoing. It is a process, however, that periodically requires intense focus and reasonable, deliberate change. A greenhouse environment is one strategy for a program’s achieving that type of focused attention when writing program administrators and faculty everywhere are juggling multiple responsibilities.

CONCLUSION

As a result of their early start in the greenhouse, the writing programs at my institution have developed with relative speed. The growth we have seen in the past five years has been a direct result of concentrated and *collective* efforts that responded to our institutional and departmental environments.¹ Only a few years ago I would have described the writing program at my institution in terms of its potential; the program was in no danger of disappearing, but neither was it thriving. In a decade that saw the number of tenure-line English faculty drop from 50 to 33, the hardiest elements of the department survived; but there was little new growth, and the writing program had suffered the effects of long-term resource budget cuts. The challenge we faced at the beginning of this new decade was one that other writing programs might find familiar: we

needed to build community and visibility; improve working conditions; increase enrollments; and somehow nurture new growth. Five years later, we've made some significant changes, and we now need to do another round of planning to recognize new or continuing strengths, identify new or continuing needs, and establish goals for a new five-year plan. It's understood that changes will occur, but will our writing program be able to anticipate and initiate change? I am confident that it will.

Despite the many advantages of the greenhouse model that my institution used to encourage change, I want to emphasize that the greenhouse is an oddly hybrid model: it draws upon a garden metaphor that originated in a corporate management context dedicated to increasing the production of tangible goods or profits. While a greenhouse used in an academic setting is not likely to nurture a writing program's ability to become self-funding, it can offer a useful space for cultivating change—whether the program changes and challenges result from retirements and budget cuts or from a desire to renew or expand an established program. The greenhouse creates a controlled climate of experimentation and support that recognizes that continuity and change are both parts of the growth process. Even a greenhouse that affirms continuity rather than initiates change has benefits: the greenhouse process forces immediate collective reflection on how and why certain traditions exist and work within our institutions.

In our case, the greenhouse experiment provided an interesting, innovative mechanism for stimulating programmatic reflection and change. It helped our department to focus on planning, design, and regeneration based on a realistic sense of working conditions, environment, and available resources. Our next five-year strategic plan (which we are drafting this year) will benefit from the lessons we learned as a department.

APPENDIX

A SAMPLE OUTLINE FOR GREENHOUSE MEETINGS

GREENHOUSE MEETING 1: IDENTIFY STRENGTHS, NEEDS , AND GOALS

Before the first meeting:

1. Identify a steering committee or find an academically-savvy team of facilitators.
2. Complete a self-study prior to the first departmental meeting. Departments might use or adapt the "ADE Checklist and Guide for

Reviewing Departments of English” or the “Guidelines for Self-Study to Precede a Writing Program Evaluation.” At the university level, an accreditation review can serve a similar purpose since most accreditation reviews begin with a self-study.

3. Have a brief meeting so the faculty may agree on an approach and a schedule (e.g., agreeing to a series of three six-hour meetings over as short a time as possible).
4. Ask each faculty member to read the self-study and identify three strengths and three needs as the basis for departmental brainstorming at the first meeting.

At the first meeting:

1. Identify a recorder and time keeper. If your faculty is not large, you can probably work as one large group; otherwise, break into groups of 10–12.
2. Identify strengths and needs by recording everyone’s ideas onto flip charts.
3. Establish consensus by letting everyone vote for the top five strengths and top five needs (perhaps with a different colored adhesive dot for each vote) to see where the consensus lies. In theory, an individual can cast all their votes for one item.
4. Brainstorm a limited number of goals for extending strengths and addressing needs. (A limited number, say five or fewer, helps keep the discussion focused.)

GREENHOUSE MEETING 2: ESTABLISH PRIORITIES AND STRATEGIES FOR CHANGE

Before the second meeting

1. Ask each faculty member to reflect on the list of strengths, needs, and tentative goals that emerged from the first meeting.
2. Ask each faculty member to brainstorm three or more strategies for meeting each of the tentative goals already identified.

At the second meeting

1. Identify a recorder and time keeper.

2. Proceeding deliberately through each goal, identify possible strategies for achieving each; record all ideas on flip charts.
3. Establish consensus by letting everyone vote for the top three strategies for each goal; this allows the department to see where the consensus lies. Again, an individual could cast all three (or five or six) votes for one item.
4. If your department has more than one working group going through the process, allow a comment period that is led by facilitators or a steering committee. Ask each group to present its strengths, needs, goals, and strategies, allowing time for discussion.

GREENHOUSE MEETING 3: HAMMER OUT A PROPOSAL FOR PROGRAMMATIC CHANGE

Before the third meeting

1. Create a clean copy of the work that emerged from the first two sessions of the greenhouse process. What are the most important strengths to maintain or extend? What are the greatest needs? What are the agreed goals and strategies to achieve them?
2. If your program has multiple groups working through the first parts of the process, this is a good time to see if those involved can combine lists, either through some online voting or discussion; if the group agrees, a facilitator or peer steering committee may identify patterns that emerge between and among groups, thereby creating “essential item” lists.
3. Ask each faculty member to read the clean copy of the draft to identify any final questions, comments, suggestions, additions or deletions to discuss before presenting the information to the dean and provost.

At the third meeting

1. Revise or edit the draft as necessary. Discuss the specific audience and purpose for the document. What does the faculty want the dean and provost to do or think after reading this document? How does the writing program want to present itself? Will the dean and provost need any additional background information or factual support? For instance, what enrollment data or budget information might they want to see?

2. Establish a timeline for the final revisions, faculty review, and submission to the dean and provost.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I want to thank my colleagues Catherine Gouge, Patrick Conner, Timothy Dow Adams, and Timothy Sweet for their helpful comments on an early draft of this essay.

NOTES

1 For a detailed account of the necessarily larger, departmental curricular revisions that resulted from our greenhouse experiment, please see my colleague Marilyn Francus's essay, "Design and Consent: Notes on Curriculum Revision" in *Profession 2001*. In terms of the work that initially established West Virginia University's Center for Writing Excellence, I would like to recognize the contributions of Gerald Lang, Provost; M. Duane Nellis, former Dean of the Eberly College of Arts and Sciences; Patrick Conner and Timothy Dow Adams, past and current Chairs of the English Department; and colleagues Margaret Racin, Thomas Miles, Winston Fuller, James Harms, Kevin Oderman, and Timothy Sweet.

WORKS CITED

- "ADE Checklist and Guide for Reviewing Departments of English." 1985; PDF version 1995. Association of Departments of English. 11 Nov. 2005. <<http://www.ade.org/reports/checklist.htm>>.
- Bialostosky, Don. "Budget Thoughts." *ADE Bulletin* 127 (2001): 20-22. 11 Nov. 2005. <<http://www.ade.org/ade/bulletin/n127/127013.htm>>.
- Bloom, Lynn Z. "Are We Having Fun Yet? Necessity, Creativity, and Writing Program Administration." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 26 (Fall 2002): 57-70.
- Chabot, Barry. "Reading Institutional Budgets." *ADE Bulletin* 127 (2001): 13-19. 11 Nov. 2005. <<http://www.ade.org/ade/bulletin/N127/127020.htm>>.
- Dixon, Terrell. "Getting and Spending and the English Department Chair." *ADE Bulletin* 120 (1998): 40-43. 11 Nov. 2005. <<http://www.ade.org/ade/bulletin/n120/120040.htm>>.
- Francus, Marilyn. "Design and Consent: Notes on Curriculum Revision." *Profession 2001*: 149-60.
- "Guidelines for Self-Study to Precede a Writing Program Evaluation." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 17.1-2 (1993): 88-95.
- "Investing in Faculty." *New Directions for Higher Education* 119 (Fall 2002): 53-58.
- Lamott, Anne. *Bird by Bird: Some Instructions on Writing and Life*. New York: Anchor-Random House, 1994.

- Pascale, Richard T. and Anne Miller. "The Action Lab: Creating a Greenhouse for Organizational Change." *Fourth Quarter* 17 (1999): 64–72.
- Reid, E. Shelley. "A Changing for the Better: Curriculum Revision as Reflective Practice in Teaching and Administration." *WPA: Writing Program Administration* 26 (Spring 2003): 10–27.
- Ross, David. S. "Planning a Home Greenhouse." *Extension Fact Sheet 645*. 1996. College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of Maryland. 10 Nov. 2005 <<http://www.agnr.umd.edu/MCE/Publications/Publication.cfm?ID=46&cat=L>>.

