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This descriptive study re-examines the graduate education of doctoral students in rhetoric and composition in light of the field’s civic tradition. This project explores the current preparation of rhetoric and composition students in Ph.D. programs and then focuses primarily on how doctoral programs are preparing aspiring new faculty members to learn about and engage in work that serves the public good. At the beginning of this project, I hypothesized that civic engagement activities are taking place within doctoral programs in rhetoric and composition, but the question then became how. Seven research questions were developed in order to establish exigency for the study and to make a case for how engagement can be better incorporated into rhetoric and composition graduate education. Guided by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges’ (NASULGC) Kellogg Commission’s definition of civic engagement, the empirical part of this study consisted of two modes of inquiry. Data collection in the first mode involved textual scholarship by examining the curricula offerings as reported in the 2007 Rhetoric Review Survey of the 67 Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition in the United States. In the second mode, data was collected from a pilot study questionnaire, which was electronically distributed to the directors of 70 rhetoric and composition doctoral programs in the United States as listed in the website of the Doctoral Consortium in Rhetoric and Composition. For both modes, manifestations of civic engagement were identified in specific categories based on themes that emerged from participants’ (i.e. directors of Doctoral Rhetoric and Composition Programs) responses. These categories pointed to specific opportunities where
programs may become more fully engaged. In addition to this qualitative data, selective, carefully chosen quantitative data also supported the discussion. In the third mode of this project, then, I based my recommendations on these opportunities/approaches, both qualitative and quantitative data from directors’ plans for future civic engagement initiatives, and the larger body of work on engagement. To conclude this project, I made the case that bringing engagement more fully into rhetoric and composition graduate education can better prepare graduates for their future faculty work, and I argued that engaged preparation changes the nature of graduate education, from the way we discuss graduate student work and preparation to how faculty and graduate students collaborate in research.
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Chapter One: Overview of the Dissertation

“As our colleagues in English consider how to ‘go public,’ they should look to rhetoric and composition because we are already there. Unlike most English professors, many of us already collaborate with schools, community colleges, corporations, and agencies, and we do research on service learning, community literacies, workplace writing, political rhetoric, computers, and writing in the disciplines. Research, teaching, and service are indistinguishable in much of the work done in rhetoric and composition because we research teaching, write about our collaborations with schools, and assign our students to write about their work with social service agencies…. The civic tradition in rhetoric presents many other sources that can be reinterpreted against changing conceptions of service, teaching, and research to make remediations of literacy central to the public mission of college English.” (Miller, “Lest We Go” 32).

... 

The overview of this dissertation begins with an epigraph from Thomas Miller’s 2004 article “Lest We Go the Way of Classics: Toward a Rhetorical Future for English Departments,” because it succinctly points to rhetoric and composition’s legacy of civic action, a tradition of public intellectuals that hails from classical times. Certainly, composition has historically demonstrated a preference for “reasoned action in the world” (Young 212). Because of this, it has remained a distinctively engaged field where civic engagement activities take place as service-learning in freshman composition courses, as faculty research at and for community agencies, and as scholarship where civic action and reflection are then explored by a faculty member. Moreover, Miller argues that a longstanding goal in rhetoric and composition is that of training students to become “engaged” democratic citizens, as well as conducting and publishing engaged scholarship for the public good. While this may be true, most of the field’s current
scholarship focuses on the engaged undergraduate student citizen, most publishing about engagement is being done by experienced, not young, faculty in the field, and there is very little in the way of scholarship discussing the training of the engaged doctoral student in rhetoric and composition. This gap in scholarship is compounded by the current social, economic and political climate, when higher education needs to make itself useful to the community in which it is situated and its needs. Although the field has been aware of this gap at the early stages of the engagement movement (in 1999 Richard Miller argued that the field needs to explore “what it means to be a graduate student training for entry into this profession” (321)), this research project explores and addresses graduate student preparation in rhetoric and composition for careers that contribute to the public good.

To begin with, this dissertation study has grown out of evolving research and academic perspectives of scholars in higher education and the field of rhetoric and composition who recognize the necessity for establishing strong connections between the curriculum and community work. The terms used to define these current civic pursuits in the academy currently remain varied. The terms may include, but are not limited to, civic engagement, service-learning, and scholarship of engagement. For the purposes of this project, the discussion will be developed through a civic engagement lens in order to foreground particular aspects of civic learning experiences and scholarly pursuits. There are numerous definitions of civic engagement. However, for this research study, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges’ (NASULGC) Kellog Commission will provide the basis of the definition: “By engagement, we refer to institutions that have redesigned their teaching, research, and extension and service functions to become even more sympathetically and productively involved with their communities, however community may be defined”
As previously mentioned above, within the field of rhetoric and composition, civic engagement activities may be taking place as service-learning initiatives in first year composition courses, as well as taking place at the faculty level as scholarship of engagement and other scholarly endeavors. These activities might occur in graduate courses, required or elective, or they might be encouraged and facilitated by an institution’s office of service-learning or civic engagement. One thing is certain, though: Now more than ever, it is important that the field of rhetoric and composition situate itself within the community by not only preparing doctoral graduates in the field to be productive citizen scholars but also by providing the learning environment in which the students may participate in civic engagement activities.

This learning environment can only exist because experienced instructors and faculty members create the engaged space. One way that future faculty members may gain this experience is during the doctoral program as doctoral students where civic engagement activities may be incorporated into the curriculum or may be encouraged through involvement with a community outreach program; because graduate level civic engagement preparation in rhetoric and composition programs provides the focus of this project, in later chapters greater detail will be given to the various manifestations of civic engagement activities at the graduate level.

Returning to current doctoral student preparation, in her 2008 publication, *Writing Matters: Rhetoric in Public and Private Lives*, Andrea Lunsford directly addresses graduate student preparation in her chapter titled “Thoughts on Graduate Education in English.” In this chapter, Lunsford essentially criticizes the current state of graduate student preparation in the rhetoric and composition doctorate programs. At the same time, she offers recommendations for reform. Speaking broadly about the graduate curriculum and climate, Lunsford asserts that graduate students must be viewed as colleagues and brought into “serious engagement with the issues of
how best to teach (and to learn) language, literature, and writing” (63). She argues that programs should “consider carefully what students actually do during their years of graduate study, in terms of courses they take, the classes they TA for and teach, and the series of hoops all students must pass through in securing the degree” (64). More relevant to this dissertation, Lunsford offers a re-visioning of graduate student preparation by suggesting that programs “offer opportunities for engaging literacy…. Working within the community reinforces the practice of collaboration, of shared knowledge production of responsibility (and what Bakhtin calls response-ibility), and of merging literacy practices advocated in earlier parts of this talk” (71). Although, by community, Lunsford does not explicitly suggest the public in which the university is situated beyond the academic walls, the assertion she broadly makes can easily be applied specifically to the focus of this dissertation. The work Lunsford envisions taking place in learning groups or writing communities reinforces the importance of collaboration – the kind of collaboration that takes place when working with a community agency where knowledge production is shared, as is the responsibility that comes with it.

Other recent research, similar to Lunsford’s, calls for a rethinking, for reform, within the doctorate preparation of students broadly. For example, the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (CID), which involved eighty-four Ph.D.-granting departments in six fields including English, found that “students may well not understand why certain elements are required or toward what end, and faculty, if pushed, will acknowledge that there is no unified vision underpinning many of the experiences students are expected to complete” (Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, and Hutchings 5).

This dissertation couples this call for change within doctorate student preparation with the need to improve and increase civic engagement preparation. This dissertation’s research
inquiry attempts to address a specific question: if and how rhetoric and composition programs are preparing graduate students to do civic engagement in their teaching and scholarship in faculty careers. This research project hypothesizes that civic engagement activities are taking place within doctoral programs in rhetoric and composition. But the question is how? In other words, this study explores how doctoral programs in rhetoric and composition prepare doctoral students for future faculty careers that contribute to the public good and how they might incorporate more engaged activities if there are no current initiatives practiced or promoted.

The project focuses on graduate student preparation and how it may be modified to incorporate, or at least encourage, civic engagement activities that may be used to prepare rhetoric and composition graduate students to be engaged faculty members. The study involved review of the descriptions of 67 programs in the 2007 Rhetoric Review survey of rhetoric and composition doctoral programs and a pilot study survey distributed to the 70 or so rhetoric and composition doctoral programs in the United States, as listed in the Rhetoric Doctoral Consortium website. This study furthers the kind of scholarship of engagement Ernest Boyer advocated for when he called for application of knowledge that encourages professors to become "'reflective practitioners' moving from theory to practice, and from practice to theory, which in fact makes theory, then, more authentic [...]" (Boyer 146). As previously mentioned, scholarship of engagement is just one aspect of civic engagement, and although this quote from Boyer does not explicitly tie to civic engagement, the importance of the reflective practitioner in scholarship of engagement contributes to the scholarly and public work done by doctoral students and faculty alike. This dissertation study is a way to bridge the separation between theory and practice by addressing doctoral student preparation to be civically engaged faculty members. By doing so, this study discovers larger implications about how rhetoric and
composition doctoral programs may become more fully engaged, as well as how graduates from more fully engaged programs are better prepared for faculty careers.

Clearly, the field of rhetoric and composition has a long and honored history of involvement in civic functions, and, indeed, at least one dissertation (Heather Fester’s “Rhetoric and Scholarship of Engagement: Pragmatic, Professional, and Ethical Convergences”) has explored rhetoric as an engaged discipline. So, it is interesting that a review of current scholarship reveals little civic engagement activities taking place in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs. The classical rhetorical tradition demonstrates rhetoric’s use as a way to explore solutions to practical, social problems, as Bizzell and Herzberg explore. Aristotle, Isocrates, Cicero, Petrarch, as well as other sophists and humanists, aligned themselves with “concerns that rhetoric make itself useful to society” (Bizzell and Herzberg 170). This concern has persisted throughout rhetoric and composition’s history. For example, in the early 20th century, Kenneth Burke theorized the impact and role language played in the public sphere and advocated for the development of useful civic engagement theoretical frameworks, as well as praxis. And at the end of that century, CCCC institutionalized service-learning by establishing a Service Learning Committee chaired by Thomas Deans. In fact, by the early to mid 1990s, Bruce Herzberg’s published research had already focused on civic engagement concerns with his article “Community Service and Critical Teaching” published in 1994 and his chapter titled “Composition and the Politics of the Curriculum” published in the edited collection titled The Politics of Writing Instruction: Postsecondary in 1991. Since that time, published research has continued to demonstrate the field’s commitment to civic engagement practices. So, it is perplexing how little seems to have changed in graduate student preparation in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs.
Based on rhetoric and composition’s historically strong civic functions and in response to Lunsford’s, as well as other similar research conducted by the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate, call for reform in doctoral preparation, this dissertation project explores various aspects of higher education and the doctorate program in rhetoric and composition, and it argues that doctoral education concurrently prepare doctoral students to become faculty members that contribute to the public good. The project examines the field’s historical connection to civic engagement, current engagement activities taking place in higher education and rhetoric and composition, and the main characteristics of the professional preparation of students in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs. Each chapter, then, substantiates the claims of Lunsford and other scholars that doctoral students should be offered opportunities to participate in engaging literacy practices by working within the community.

“Chapter Two: “Research Review: Theoretical Rationale for Incorporating Civic Engagement in Doctoral Student Preparation in Rhetoric and Composition” justifies the dissertation study with a comprehensive review of research in civic engagement and rhetoric and composition. The chapter establishes current definitions of the key terminology embodied in civic engagement, which include service-learning, scholarship of engagement, and civic engagement (see the section “Civic Engagement: A Range of Key Terminology”). As previously mentioned, a range in the terms used to define engagement activities exists in higher education. One term, civic engagement, encapsulates the multitude of terms and activities and provides a strong foundation for this project. The research review, then, grounds the history of rhetoric’s civic engagement connection (see the section “Rhetoric’s Civic Engagement Past”), and then situates this by exploring current civic engagement components in higher education and within the field (see the section “Current Civic Engagement Activities in Higher Education and
Composition”). Rhetoric’s civic engagement past provides clear examples of engaging trends while at the same time offering possibilities for civic engagement initiatives. When coupled with current civic engagement trends, the research offers a rich discussion for preparing graduate students in rhetoric and composition to join the professoriate; this examination also helps to situate the divide between current practice and the incorporation of civic engagement activities.

Finally, Chapter Two examines current rhetoric and composition graduate student preparation practices (see the section “Current Rhetoric and Composition Graduate Student Preparation”). This section is especially helpful because it provides the foundation for future research, and it is supported by a study conducted by Pierce and Enos in 2004. Pierce and Enos found that core courses within rhetoric and composition programs do not reflect current specializations in demand in job ads, and paper assignments in most courses do not help students build a dossier of publications, even though expertise in these specializations and record of publication are becoming more and more important to landing a job out of graduate school. In fact, across higher education, the rationale for doctoral education program requirements is either lost in historical traditions or lack a unified vision, as Pierce and Enos, as well as other research, have discovered.

As a whole, Chapter Two illustrates that, although civic engagement is clearly supported in a wide range of scholarship, more needs to be addressed regarding how civic engagement initiatives can be incorporated at the doctorate level and how this incorporation benefits graduate students, faculty, programs, and institutions. Boyer points out that “abundant evidence shows that both the civic and academic health of any culture is vitally enriched as scholars and practitioners speak and listen carefully to each other” (145). The review of research demonstrates that current scholarship does indeed support that civic engagement trends and
activities take place in the field, but there is still more that can be suggested for programmatic change in regards to graduate student preparation. The chapter ends with the section “Directions for Future Research,” which then provides the basis for the following chapters.

“Chapter Three: Overview of the Study” discusses in detail the research questions and methodology of the study, including the participants (or programs examined), variables, data collection instrument, and limitations involved. The programs examined in this study included the 67 rhetoric and composition doctoral programs’ curricula offerings as reported in the 2007 *Rhetoric Review* survey and the 70 or so doctoral rhetoric and composition program directors associated with the Doctoral Consortium in Rhetoric and Composition and their responses from my questionnaire in the pilot study. The study followed a qualitative descriptive research design to examine the data, and selective, carefully chosen quantitative data supports the discussion of findings.

“Chapter Four: Study Findings and Analysis” addresses three of the seven research questions outlined in Chapter Three. It begins by discussing the nine themes that emerged in both the *Rhetoric Review* survey and the responses to my questionnaire. Then, it explores the *Rhetoric Review* survey data, and discusses the data collected from my pilot study questionnaire—specifically the first five questions. This part of the chapter first looks at how rhetoric and composition graduate program directors define civic engagement practices and then addresses how their specific program prepares current graduate assistants for engaged faculty work. Chapter Four then briefly draws conclusions about how institutions not currently incorporating civic engagement practices may develop initiatives to train instructors and prepare them for faculty civic engagement.
Finally, “Chapter Five: Conclusions and Implications: Incorporating Engagement in Rhetoric and Composition Doctoral Education,” provides the theoretical conclusions and implications of the dissertation. The discussion explores the implications of civic engagement activities that have been incorporated in rhetoric and composition graduate student preparation. It then offers recommendations for programs to become more fully engaged and argues how this might change faculty understanding of graduate student preparation and faculty scholarship. This chapter then draws conclusions about the previously posed research questions and suggests possible future study.
Chapter Two: Theoretical Rationale for
Surveying Civic Engagement Components in Doctoral Student Preparation

Introduction

“What compositionist, striving for tenure, has not wondered if her talents might do more good in
the world outside of the academy? What compositionist, upon earning tenure, has not felt some
guilt – and perhaps more than a touch of depression – as a result of being rewarded by a system
that is demonstrably corrupt? What compositionist has not looked upon his publications and
wondered, Do these make a difference? How else could I have spent my time?[....] What
compositionist has not worried that she is a little too comfortable?” (Gallagher 80)

... 

As Gallagher’s words from “We Compositionists: Toward Engaged Professionalism’’
suggest, doing work beyond the academic world remains a pressing concern for many
professionals within the field of rhetoric and composition. In fact, Richard Young was drawn to
rhetoric because there “was a kind of Deweyan preference for reasoned action in the world. […]
Rhetoric, though, offered a way of hanging on to the values that had led me into literary studies
and at the same time let me see connections between what I was doing intellectually and what
was going on in the world” (Cauthon 212). Similarly, Andrea Lunsford found the field
appealing because it “tended carefully to its effects in the world beyond as well as in the
academy” (“Rhetoric” 76). Contemporary rhetoricians’ concern for public engagement is not
surprising, because rhetoric has a longstanding history of civic functions that trace its roots to
Sophists, such as Quintillian and Cicero, as well as to humanists such as Petrarch. However,
despite this legacy, composition still grapples with relevancy just as higher education as a whole
seems to struggle. As for higher education broadly, Ernest Boyer observes the work of the academy has “become a private benefit, not a public good. Increasingly, the campus is viewed as a place where students get credentialed and faculty get tenured, while the overall work of the academy does not seem particularly relevant to the nation’s most pressing civic, social, economic, and moral problems” (“The Scholarship of Engagement” 85).

Since the 1990s when Boyer wrote Scholarship Reconsidered, he has not been alone in laboring to close the gap between the community and the academy, and within rhetoric and composition. However, as rhetoric and composition specialist James Slevin observes, reform has been a slow, even non-existent, process:

Pressure for change in higher education is unrelenting. The common message to universities from legislatures, boards, and other constituencies is this: Focus missions. Set priorities. Teach more, and become more engaged with your communities. Many institutions have responded to these pressures in good faith with various exercises in strategic planning and creative mission building, and some have seen real change. But in many others, reform efforts have run head-on into a culture that continues to reward contributions to the discipline ahead of those to the institution. Thus, many large-scale efforts to restructure faculty work have fizzled at the department level. (“Preserving Critical Faculties” 25)

Slevin’s words describe the challenges universities and disciplines face when attempting to create more relevancy in the space between academy and community work. The challenge exists for the discipline and for the faculty alike. Similarly, Gallagher observes that “efforts to make composition and rhetoric more ‘relevant’ [still include] various calls for ‘public intellectuals’ (Brandt; Daniell, Hawisher and Selfe); and service-learning (Adler-Kasner, Crooks, and Watters;
Deans; Herzberg; Wells; Welch)” (76). In other words, the work that Boyer began nearly twenty years ago, remains a turbulent and pertinent space within rhetoric and composition as the field continues to struggle to create and define itself as an engaged discipline.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a theoretical rationale for the dissertation. My research began with a central question: How are rhetoric and composition programs preparing graduate students to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers? Because it is clear that civic engagement preparation occurs in various forms within doctoral programs in rhetoric and composition, this chapter focuses on several theoretical frameworks. These consist of defining key civic engagement terms; exploring the field’s historic civic activities; investigating civic engagement activities in higher education and rhetoric; and identifying the main characteristics of current doctoral student professional development in rhetoric and composition. Certainly, civic engagement efforts need to occur within the discipline; and this project does not underestimate the importance of reforming how we not only reward the work of public intellectuals in rhetoric and composition but also how we prepare them to do the work. I agree with a 1992 College Composition and Communication editor’s column, “Diversity in a Mainline Journal,” which called for “widening consideration of the way scholarship in composition studies is viewed, of how it should be evaluated, and of ways scholars in our field can more effectively present themselves for tenure and promotion” (Gebhardt 442). But in this project, I focus on how future faculty are, and can be, prepared to do public good in their faculty work. Based on the data collected from the Rhetoric Review survey data and my pilot study, this dissertation explores how doctoral programs in rhetoric and composition prepare doctoral students for future faculty careers that contribute to the public
good. It also explores how this might change our understanding of graduate student training and faculty scholarship.

To situate this study and my conclusions, this chapter draws on initial research to provide two kinds of background data from textual scholarship and survey data. The first section, “Civic Engagement: A Range of Key Terminology,” explores three main terms – civic engagement, service-learning, and scholarship of engagement – that are shared by the field and other academic disciplines in higher education. Interestingly enough, each term holds numerous definitions and is conceptualized quite differently depending on the program, university, or discipline. Nevertheless, overlap does exist and one term most accurately and succinctly defines what this project identifies as civic activities in rhetoric and composition. Section two, “Rhetoric’s Civic Engagement Past,” briefly reviews the discipline’s legacy of civic functions beginning with the sophists and humanists. This section contextualizes rhetoric and composition’s clear civic engagement past in order to provide recommendations for reform in later chapters. Section three, “Current Civic Engagement Activities in Higher Education and Composition,” explores contemporary manifestations of civic engagement within the field. These manifestations surface as application, teaching, research and scholarship, and the discussion provides a clear connection between rhetoric’s classical civic functions and its contemporary concerns of relevancy to the community. Section four, “Current Rhetoric and Composition Graduate Student Preparation,” provides an overview of contemporary graduate student preparation within the field. It looks to the 2004 Pierce and Enos survey of rhetoric and composition doctoral education to ground the discussion. The section ends by briefly contextualizing and justifying the dissertation’s purpose and goal in order to segue to “Chapter Three: Overview of the Study.”
Civic Engagement: A Range of Key Terms

Although the pedagogical goals of rhetoric and composition have included developing persuasive discourse, the pursuit of truth, and the active citizen/rhetorician, the terms used to define the civic aims currently remain varied, including civic engagement, service-learning, and scholarship of engagement. This project focuses on civic engagement because the term embodies rhetorical theories and can be applied to teaching, research, and theoretical development. It also involves a broader community context, as William Plater explores in his chapter “Civic Engagement, Service-Learning, and Intentional Leadership.” According to Plater, civic engagement incorporates various terms and forms such as “practice-based learning, community-based learning, active learning, experiential learning, and learning under other names that combines practice with theory or action with reflection [that] can accept the value of a widely shared understanding of what is expected for learning that enacts civic engagement” (5). There are and need to be many definitions and manifestations of civic engagement activities in higher education, because they articulate the role, purpose and form of the civic learning experience of an institution’s mission and well-defined outcomes. However, as Plater asserts, there are “emerging and converging definitions of what should be expected as part of a legitimate [civic engagement] experience” (5). For this dissertation, The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges’ (NASULGC) Kellogg Commission provides the definitive definition for civic engagement: “By engagement, we refer to institutions that have redesigned their teaching, research, and extension and service functions to become even more sympathetically and productively involved with their communities, however community may be defined” (NASULGC 27).
Legitimate civic engagement experiences in rhetoric and composition involve not only what we do but what we say, and these experiences contribute to our understanding and definition of civic engagement. In *Critical Literacy in Action: Writing Words, Changing Worlds* Ira Shor argues that through “speech and other actions, we build ourselves in a world that is building us. We can remake ourselves and society, if we choose, through alternative words and dissident projects” (1). For Shor, this is not only where critical literacy begins but where alternative paths to social and self-development arise. Critical literacy for Shor supports the argument Edward Schiappa asserts in “Intellectuals and the Place of Cultural Critique” when he writes that the artificial walls between academic disciplines and the community need to be destroyed in order to address common issues of concern. Schiappa writes, “The point is not that [rhetoric and composition as a field] have some sort of special sight that allows us to understand culture “more clearly” than mere mortals. The point is that to the extent that we do not share our insights and abilities, public discourse is correspondingly impoverished” (26). Critical literacy interprets and critiques this public discourse, and civic engagement activities within rhetoric and composition embody this. It connects political and personal, public and private, global and local, and even, as Shor discusses, economic and the pedagogical:

Critical literacy, then, is an attitude toward history that sees language as symbolic action, as Kenneth Burke (1984) might have said; a dream of a new society against the power now in power, as Paulo Freire proposed (Shor and Freire 1987); an insurrection of subjugated knowledge, in the ideas of Michel Foucault (1980); a counterhegemonic structure of feeling as Raymond Williams (1977) theorized; a multicultural resistance invented on the borders of identities, as Gloria Anzaldua (1990) imagined; or language
used against fitting unexceptionably into the status quo, as Adrienne Rich (1979) declared. (1)

As Shor’s words suggest, critical literacy in rhetoric and composition embodies many aspects of civic engagement activities in higher education, especially when situated within a community. Civic engagement, then, can also be defined as the application of rhetorical traditions with a broader community context.

Ira Harkavy, on the other hand, according to Plater, offered a compelling explanation of the “modern emergence of the engaged university” in his keynote address, “Honoring Community, Honoring Place,” to the June 2002 National Gathering of Educators for Civic Engagement:

How can the idea of the new type of university be credibly explained? In part, as a response to the growing concern for the state of democracy. And in part as a defensive response to the increasingly immoral contradiction between the increasing status, wealth, and power of American higher education – particularly its elite research university component – and the unnecessary poverty and deprivation afflicting millions of Americans, particularly those living within our cities. In short, the manifest contradiction between the power and the performance of American higher education sparked the emergence of the idea of Democratic, Cosmopolitan, Community-Building, Engaged University. (p.8 qtd. in Plater, 10)

Service and reflection are inherent in both statements by the NASULGC Kellogg Commission and Harkavy, and both are necessary in order to address the contradictions of power and performance not only in higher education but also within the community. According to Ernest Lynton in the 1995 AAHE publication Making the Case for Professional Service, “‘service’ then [has] a very precise meaning. It [signifies] the utilization of a university as an
intellectual resource for its immediate as well as broader constituencies. It implied a collective responsibility integral and important to the institutional mission” (8). Through this statement, it is apparent that there is an intersection of service (from service-learning) and civic engagement. Civic engagement seems to imply broader, program-wide concerns, as well as broad faculty priorities, from theory building in research and scholarship to application in teaching, while service-learning occurs as specific characteristics in a specific course, as well as student learning that takes place within a specific service-learning course. Service-learning may comprise one aspect of civic engagement activities within the field of rhetoric and composition. Expanding the NASULGC Kellogg Commission definition, civic engagement, then, is the utilization of the field’s intellectual resources, from teaching, scholarship, and extension and service functions, for the immediate and broad community in which it is situated. Civic engagement need not involve service or scholarship; however, there are instances where engagement is involved in both. Where engagement involves service and learning, we find service-learning occurring, and where it involves scholarship, then civic engagement becomes scholarship of engagement. Both important terms are briefly explored below in the following subsections.

Defining Service-Learning

In 1990, Jane Kendall found 147 definitions of service-learning in the academic literature in print (Eyler and Giles). However, in their 1999 Where’s the Learning in Service-Learning, Janet Eyler and Dwight Giles defined service-learning as “any program that attempts to link academic study with service […] non-course-based programs that include a reflective component and learning goals may also be included under this umbrella” (5). I agree with this general definition; however the following definitions also provide insight to more specific aspects of service-learning.
A broad, university-wide, emerging definition developed and promoted by the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) and Campus Compact (2003) offers the following:

Service-learning means a method under which students learn and develop through thoughtfully-organized service that: is conducted in and meets the needs of a community and is coordinated with an institution of higher education, and with the community; helps foster civic responsibility; is integrated into and enhances the academic curriculum of the students enrolled; and includes structured time for students to reflect on the service experience. (¶ 1)

Similarly, building upon existing definitions, the National Service-Learning Clearinghouse asserts that service learning combines “service tasks with structured opportunities that link the task to self-reflection, self-discovery, and the acquisition and comprehension of values, skills, and knowledge content” (What is Service-Learning? section, ¶ 2). Although there are many variations defining service-learning, William Plater asserts that “there are no right answers for defining and implementing service-learning programs; [however] there are clear best practice models and clear ethical standards – standards that invariably can be made compatible with the institution’s mission and the academic officer’s duties” (7). Current civic engagement practices in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs will be discussed in chapter four and may provide some insight to best practices.

Defining Scholarship of Engagement

The work of the late Ernest Boyer, former president of the Carnegie Academy for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, provides the foundation for scholarship of engagement. Boyer’s original concern was to broaden the definition of scholarship beyond research to include the scholarship of teaching, application, and integration. He explored scholarship in both his
1990 *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate*, as well as his “The Scholarship of Engagement.” In *Scholarship Reconsidered* he concluded that much of American higher education has “[…] moved from an emphasis on the student to an emphasis on the professoriate, from emphasis on generalized education to specialized education, and from loyalty to the campus to loyalty to the profession” (76). Because the academy seemed to lack relevance to the realities of contemporary life, Boyer’s vision of scholarship would essentially legitimate scholarly work that positively impacted the communities in which the universities were located.

In “The Scholarship of Engagement,” Boyer defines scholarship of engagement as “[…] connecting the rich resources of the university to our most pressing social, civic, and ethical problems, to our children, to our schools, to our teachers, and to our cities” (21). Similarly, according to the Clearinghouse and National Review Board for The Scholarship of Engagement, scholarship of engagement is a “term that captures scholarship in the areas of teaching, research, and/or service. It engages faculty in academically relevant work that simultaneously meets campus mission and goals as well as community needs. In essence, it is a scholarly agenda that integrates community issues. In this definition community is broadly defined to include audiences external to the campus that are part of a collaborative process to contribute to the public good” (Clearinghouse and National Review Board). Although I agree with both definitions, it is the second that captures where scholarship of engagement is involved in civic engagement. When civic engagement entails research and/or results in publication, then scholarship becomes scholarship of engagement. The integration of this scholarly agenda in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs is important because of the research and publication emphasis of much of graduate work.
Following the kind of civic engagement activities Boyer calls for when he discusses scholarship of engagement, Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff in *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*, continue the research Boyer began by exploring the range and change in nature of scholarly activities being conducted in contemporary colleges and universities. Essentially, the authors of *Scholarship Assessed* propose new standards for scholarly activity, also known as scholarship of engagement. They write that a “scholar must not confine his or her creative products to folders or computer files, however risky it may appear to enter the larger arena where ideas are critiqued and evaluated” (66). In fact, by doing this the professoriate and – I would add – the doctoral candidate “can enrich and further theoretical knowledge, strengthen practical applications of knowledge, and demonstrate new ways of looking at the connecting points where different kinds of knowledge converge” (66). By broadening the scholarly activities and expectations of graduate student work, rhetoric and composition doctoral education integrates a civic engagement scholarly agenda that connects different kinds of knowledge. Just as Glassick, Huber, and Maeroff’s research furthered Boyer’s discussion, the scope of this dissertation will strive to add to the discussion by examining the changes in scholarly activity within civic engagement and how this supports the place of civic engagement in the preparation of graduate students in rhetoric and composition programs. The dissertation also will build on recent scholarship on engaged research (e.g. Van de Ven’s *Engaged Scholarship: A Guide for Organizational and Social Research*) and scholarship that sees the engaged faculty member doing work that contributes to the public good. For example, Kecskes’s *Engaging Departments: Moving Faculty Culture from Private to Public, Individual to Collective Focus for the Common Good* provides a broad perspective for creating engaged departments thereby supporting the activities that take place in broad civic engagement activities, such as service-learning and
scholarship of engagement initiatives. In fact, both Van de Ven and Kecskes also focus on meta-level strategies for incorporating engagement, national exemplars of departmental approaches, and contextual designs and research for departments; and this information will be helpful in later chapters where the discussion will revolve around recommendations for best practices.

Rhetoric’s Civic Engagement Past

Rhetoric and composition has had a long and honored history of civic functions. This is evident as early as Isocrates, who wrote that the “successful rhetor is a useful citizen who makes useful citizens of others” (Antidosis 61). Gerard Hauser writes in “Rhetorical Democracy and Civic Engagement,”

the resilience of the Athenian linkage of the people’s voice to rhetorical discourse is more than a vestige […]. Western politics sustains the connection between civic issues and setting public policy because democratic governance – which regards the people’s interests as its rhetorical, if not theoretical, foundation – has narrated advancing their interests as a primary virtue of good governance. (2)

Although his discussion focuses on rhetorical democracy, this quote from Hauser provides evidence of rhetoric’s civic, Athenian roots. S. Michael Halloran, in his “Afterthoughts on Rhetoric and Public Discourse” also asserts that “the efforts of citizens to shape the fate of their community... would surely have been of interest to American neo-classical rhetoricians of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries” (2). Both Hauser and Halloran demonstrate not only rhetoric’s history of civic activities but also that this trend has persisted throughout its existence. In fact, there are many classical manifestations of early civic engagement practices in
the rhetorical tradition that the contemporary field of rhetoric and composition may examine not only to situate and ground current practices but also, perhaps, to help guide future endeavors.

Four key figures from the classics – Aristotle, Isocrates, Cicero and Quintillian – clearly demonstrate the field’s civic past. During this time, the purpose and use of texts shifted from chronicling events (as in the case of Homer) and finalizing laws to exploring all branches of knowledge during the Sophistic Movement. The Sophists argued that “probable knowledge can be refined by pitting opposing positions against one another and examining the arguments thus brought forward” (Bizzell and Herzberg 22). One way that this could be achieved was through the Greek concept of *paideia*. This is commonly translated as “education” and Aristotle’s *Parts of Animals* provides crucial insight into how *paideia* was conceptualized:

There are, as it seems, two ways in which a person may be competent in respect of any study or investigation, whether it be a noble one or a humble: he may have either what can rightly be called scientific knowledge [*episteme*] of the subject; or he may have what is roughly described as an educated person’s competence, and therefore be able to judge correctly which parts of an exposition are satisfactory and which are not. That, in fact is the sort of person we take the “man of general education” [*paideia*] to be. (639a 1-10).

Aristotle contrasts two forms of knowing – *episteme*, which is scientific knowledge, and *paideia*, which is, generally, the “educated person’s competency. Aristotle then further argues that we can possess *episteme* “for a limited field only” (639a 12). In other words, we can only be specialists in limited arenas. However, *paideia* seeks more – the needs of the educated citizen in a *polis*. I argue that this is where rhetoric’s civic functions began because this notion of *paideia* was taught or given to children “with an eye to the constitution” (Aristotle 1145); and only
through *paideia* was the state “united and made into a community”(1152). According to Werner Jaeger, *paideia* implied the ideal of Greek culture where education seeks ideal standards by searching for the universal within teaching and learning. The universal ideal of education in Athenian culture consisted of men using “knowledge as a formative force in education” so to “shape the living [person]” (xxii). Although not explicitly stated, this Athenian ideal is quite similar to our contemporary Western ideal of higher education: shaping students in order to be productive members of a community. But historically rhetoric has encouraged more than good citizenry. Isocrates’ concern was “that rhetoric make itself useful to society” (Bizzell and Herzberg 170). For Isocrates, a sophist, this occurred only when “men […] take advantage of the good and not the evil things in life […] those who pursue and practice those studies which will enable us to govern wisely both our own households and the commonwealth – which should be the objects of our toil, or our study, and of our every act” (*Antidosis* 78).

Further evidence of rhetoric’s civic engagement roots can be linked to the tradition’s cultural ideal – the orator (Halloran, “Rhetoric in the American”). According to Michael Halloran, in “On the End of Rhetoric,” the orator “takes all knowledge as his province, becomes a kind of living repository of the accumulated wisdom of the culture, and puts what he knows to practical use in guiding the conduct of human affairs” (333). Similarly, Cicero’s discourse stressed the civic responsibility of orators during this period. In his thesis from *De Oratore*, Cicero argues that the function of oratory to society and the state is quite “kingly” so as “to bring help to the suppliant, to raise up those that are cast down, to bestow security, to set free from peril, to maintain men in their civil rights” (293). Public issues are of central concern to Cicero’s rhetorical theories. Halloran asserts that the “rhetorical tradition portrayed the orator as a person who embodies all that is best in a culture and brings it to bear on public problems through
eloquent discourse” (“Rhetoric in the American” 94). Clearly, Cicero and other rhetoricians from this period emphasize a tradition that is not only an art but a form of communication that focuses on “public problems, problems that arise from our life in political societies” (94). Bizzell and Herzberg underscore this emphasis when they compare Quintilian’s theories with those of Cicero when they write that “Quintilian envisions the creation, through rhetorical training that includes broadly humane learning, of a “good man speaking well” [– vir bonus dicendi peritus –] who might save the state” (8).

Also aligning himself with Cicero, Petrarch, a humanist, admired Cicero’s word humanitas, which he used for the Greek paideia. This “indicated an ideal of cultivated learning. The accomplished man should be able to combine literary art, moral philosophy, and civic responsibility in his writing and oratory” (Bizzell and Herzberg 558). According to Petrarch, the inspired “humanist citizen, since Renaissance Italy, like classical Greece and Republican Rome, was organized into city-states, [as] the talented individual had the potential to strongly influence political and cultural life” (558).

There are undoubtedly other examples of the civic functions of rhetorical discourse from Athenian culture, as well as from the medieval, renaissance, and enlightenment periods. However, during the nineteenth century, civic engagement practices in rhetoric begin to manifest in different forms, especially as composition is beginning to emerge as a clearly defined branch of the field. Blair, Campbell, and Whatley dominated in this branch as they developed theories and textbooks that were first used in universities such as Harvard. As larger numbers of students began to enter new middle-class colleges, composition became a “required course taught by assistant professors and graduate assistants, and the emphasis was on expository writing” (Bizzell and Herzberg 994). Because of the breadth and diversity of the entering college student
population (women and minorities began attending universities), the social uses of language continued to be emphasized.

In Susan Kates' *Activist Rhetorics and American Higher Education 1885-1937*, the author highlights individuals who contributed to the rhetorical and civic discourse tradition. One such example is Hallie Quinn Brown who completed a degree at one of these middle-class colleges and taught thereafter. Brown’s activism was informed by her teaching experience in Dayton, Ohio, around 1884 when she taught adult students who had migrated to the North from Mississippian plantations. As Kates discusses, “This experience was an important one for Brown, because it helped her to articulate the need for adult education for African Americans; indeed many of her later educational treatises address the relationship between racism and adult illiteracy” (56). At a time when elocutionary practices provided an integral part in rhetoric and composition education, Brown stressed the enormity of the social responsibilities of the educated, and her “overt activism informs her elocutionary theory and practice” (58).

In fact, according to Janet Eldred and Peter Mortensen in “‘Persuasion Dwelt on Her Tongue’: Female Civic Rhetoric in America,”

Female civic rhetoric sought to effect political change by revealing public consensus, by appealing to a common sense of what was right; its goal was not to sway individual opinion, but to awaken the conscience of a republic. It is thus consistent with rhetoric taught in American colleges at the turn of the century: in nature, “strongly neoclassical … a rhetoric of general citizenship closely tied to the public discourse practiced in pulpit, bar, and senate of the larger society,”[...] (Clark and Halloran, Introduction 6,7). (175)

In this quote, Eldred and Mortensen reveal a number of interesting points. Most importantly, although they don’t explicitly state it, the authors highlight the civic aspects of rhetoric and
higher education by discussing female civic discourse of the nineteenth century. In fact, broadly speaking, higher education in the United States has a historically strong commitment to civic outreach. Lynton outlines this civic tradition:

The commitment to service, characteristic of American higher education from its very beginning […], was much strengthened in the state universities by the Morrill Land-Grant Act of 1862. It found its full expression toward the turn of the century, with the passage of the Hatch and the Smith-Lever Acts establishing agricultural experiment stations and the cooperative extension system, and the pronouncement of the “Wisconsin Idea” by President Van Hise of the University of Wisconsin, which rested on ‘the conviction that informed intelligence when applied to the problems of modern society could make democracy work more effectively.’ (8)

Because of the acts from 1862 and early 1900, higher education secured the importance and emphasis of faculty intellect and public life. For example, when Columbia established the Graduate School in 1881, it intended to train students, specifically men, in the “mental culture” in order to prepare them for careers in the “civil service” or as “public journalists” or for the “duties of public life” (Bender 51). During this period, John Dewey, a progressive educational reformer, developed his theories regarding the ties between knowledge production, reflection, and civic participation and responsibility. In 1900 Dewey argued that “… the school itself shall be made a genuine form of active community life, instead of a place set apart in which to learn lessons” (27). Here Dewey identifies the social influences on education and the learning discourse that take place in the academy. Through civic engagement activities, reflection, and knowledge production can one participate in genuine forms of academic and community life.
Although the two never directly interacted and actually held very different and conflicting political views, John Dewey and rhetorician Kenneth Burke theorized the impact and role language played in the public sphere. The two developed theories concurrently, although inadvertently, intertwining historically higher education and rhetoric and composition’s emphasis on education’s civic functions, and demonstrated useful civic engagement initiatives for theory and praxis. In his 2005 article, "Kenneth Burke, John Dewey, and the Pursuit of the Public," Paul Stob states that "both argue for a reconstruction in language to ameliorate specific social problems. Their focus on the use of language in the public sphere helps us better understand the problem-solving and community-building possibilities of language itself" (229). However, Burke, similar to Aristotle and Cicero, situates the theoretical component of civic engagement within rhetoric and composition.

As the next section suggests, rhetoric and composition continues to exhibit a broad range of civic engagement, as faculty members work in the community, and sometimes make that work the focus of research and publication. Sometimes this scholarship takes the form of application, as community service writing partnerships are explored. The field, then, continues its legacy of civic engagement, broadly conceived, something suggested in the Conference Call for the 2008 meeting of the Rhetoric Society of American:

Let us […] consider The Responsibilities of Rhetoric. How can the study and practice of rhetoric contribute to social progress? What does rhetoric offer as means of understanding and coping with globalization […]? What do rhetorical studies have to offer in a presidential election year when political discourses and popular fundamentalisms are polarizing, confrontational, divisive? How do new media affect civic participation and the conduct of argument […]? How can rhetorical studies
contribute to scientific exchange, technology transfer, and risk management—all in the interest of public and disciplinary good […]? Can rhetorical pedagogies nevertheless protect civil liberties, sustain civic cooperation, and promote understanding and identification?

Current Civic Engagement Activities in Higher Education and Composition

There are myriad ways in which civic engagement activities are occurring in higher education and the field of rhetoric and composition in the United States. These examples manifest as formal service programs or as engaged learning expectations in a specific college course. However, the various forms demonstrate not only how civic engagement is currently integrated in higher education and composition but also how it might be further developed and applied in graduate student preparation as future rhetoric and composition faculty who contribute to the public good.

Kevin Kecskes, Director of Community-University Partnerships at Portland State University, edited the collection Engaging Departments: Moving Faculty Culture from Private to Public, Individual to Collective Focus for the Common Good. This collection of essays offers a wealth of hands-on experiences about initiating and implementing service programs throughout the country and demonstrates the countless ways civic engagement is taking place. Institutions ranging from Portland to Philadelphia and from Los Angeles to Birmingham have developed engaged programs as part of the university curriculum, and the founders, developers and evaluators wrote concise and candid accounts about those programs in this book. For example, Alabama’s Samford University experience of developing the Birmingham Area Debate League
is vastly different from the Orange Coast Community College detail about a geology student whose geology display became a popular, must-see stop in a southern California soup kitchen.

The book consists of four parts and begins by giving readers a rationale for why institutions should incorporate a service program. It then outlines the characteristics of an engaged department and clarifies how a program could be designed, implemented, and assessed. In part three, Kecskes includes cases that demonstrate the vastly different experiences between institutions, but the focus remains on how programs must behave to foster and encourage engagement among the faculty, students, and community. Aligning the program’s mission with the civic engagement activities is just one way that programs in higher education are fostering engaged activities. For example, in Sherwyn Morreale and James Applegate’s essay, the authors discuss their experiences in using disciplinary societies to research and support engaged activity. They offer a six-step approach and note that we do risk conflict when we reenter the realm of the public intellectual and work side-by-side with community partners whom we sometimes learn from and critique.

Similar to Kecskes’ work, in Civic Responsibility and Higher Education, editor Thomas Ehrlich continues the work Eyler and Giles completed in their 1999 publications Where’s the Learning in Service-Learning? by collecting essays from national leaders who have focused on civic responsibility in higher education, from implementation at the administrative level to the undergraduate level in courses that have integrated service-learning practices. At the same time, Ehrlich’s collection also provides examples of teaching philosophies and working case studies so that innovative new programs might be developed. For example, part four of the edited collection provides a variety of perspectives regarding civic activities from different sectors of higher education, such as community colleges, liberal arts colleges, a historically black college,
and a research university to name a few. The authors that contribute to this piece attempt to address concerns for faculty and program administrators as they begin to prepare students and the institution to engage in civic functions from a campus-wide or program-specific perspective. In one of his chapters from the Ehrlich collection, Edward Zotlowski points to changing trends in specific disciplines when he writes that the “distinction – between the private sphere, which emphasizes reason and analysis, and the public sphere, which emphasizes language and action – has become a commonplace in disciplines such as English and communication studies. As the rhetorical tradition gains more and more adherents, it drives the focus of the discipline away from a search for rational certainties and logical distinctions to questions of policy and public effectiveness” (317).

Ehrlich’s collection also discusses clear links to institutional identity and social responsibility, as well as other aspects of civic engagement activities where mission statements and assessments attempt to foster an environment that values these broader activities. As Ira Harkavy and Lee Benson point out in their chapter titled “Integrating the American System of Higher, Secondary, and Primary Education to Develop Civic Responsibility,” the civic university can be credibly explained “[l]argely (though oversimply), as a defensive response to the increasingly obvious, increasingly embarrassing, and increasingly immoral contradiction between the increasing status, wealth, and power of American higher education – particularly its elite research university component” (175). The response from higher education (in the form of undergraduate classes, faculty research, and on-campus organizations, such as offices of service-learning and community partnerships) demonstrates the engaged activities taking place in universities throughout the country and provides a strong foundation for discussing and exploring civic engagement activities in higher education broadly. Rhetoric and composition
includes a wide range of civic engagement activities, which I will illustrate here by focusing on service-learning and on activist efforts for the public good.

Service-learning is one important part of the field’s civic engagement, and this was evident when the field formally recognized the need to connect the academy and the community. In 1999, CCCC institutionalized service-learning by establishing a service learning committee chaired by Thomas Deans (Reflections 3). In addition to the formation of this committee, scholarship from the past decade also demonstrates the field’s commitment to civic engagement through service-learning. For example, in the 1997 publication Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Composition, editors Adler-Kassner, Crooks, and Watters with series editor Edward Zlotkowski present the work of well-known names and contributors to the field of composition studies. It includes articles by Linda Flower, Bruce Herzberg, and Nora Bacon, to name a few, and spans a broad range of topics within the realm of service-learning and composition, such as WAC, critical teaching, civic literacy, forming partnerships, addressing basic writers, and integrating technology within the scope of civic engagement. On the other hand, Aaron Schutz and Anne Ruggles Gere’s 1998 publication explored the less-published aspect of service-learning practices. In “Service Learning and English Studies, Rethinking ‘Public’ Service,” the authors discuss the challenges and negative impact of civic engagement initiatives from Bruce Herzberg’s “Community Service and Critical Teaching”. Although the project engaged in community-based learning, the service, reflection and learning remained private – that is, to quote Herzberg, “If our students regard social problems as chiefly or only personal, then they will not search beyond the person for a systemic explanation” (as quoted in Schutz and Gere 131).

The field’s commitment to civic engagement is also evident in Thomas Deans’ 2000
publication *Writing Partnerships: Service-Learning in Composition* where he frames his theoretical approach, along with supporting case studies in the composition course. Deans addresses service-learning in composition from three contexts: writing *about, for,* and *with* the community. Similarly, Ellen Cushman's 2002 publication "Sustainable Service-Learning Programs" further situates this commitment both from an undergraduate and professoriate perspective. Cushman's article provides analysis of publications and data gathered during an outreach initiative at the University of California, Berkley, where she examines the role of the professor and argues that the role of the community site needs to be reexamined in order to foster a sustainable service-learning program.

A second broad kind of civic engagement in rhetoric and composition – activist efforts for social change – has been evolving in rhetoric and composition at least since the 1996 publication of Ellen Cushman’s “The Rhetorician as an Agent of Social Change.” In this article she addresses the other ways in which “we can affect social change, something more along the lines of civic participation” (7). She believes that “[g]iven the role rhetoricians have historically played in the politics of their communities, […] modern rhetoric and composition scholars can be agents of social change outside the university” (7). Naturally, Cushman argues that activism begins by deconstructing the sociological barriers between universities and communities, but this is often the argument of most civic engagement programs. Cushman sees activism taking place in rhetoric and composition through literacy: “Rather, we need to take into our accounts of social change the ways in which people use language and literacy to challenge and alter the circumstances of daily life. […] I've found that people disrupt the status quo of their lives with language and literacy and that the researcher, when invited to do so, can contribute resources to this end” (12-13).
The rhetorician of social change, whether as researcher or instructor, then, fits activism at a micro-level of interaction into daily interactions. Cushman reminds us that “[o]ur time is devoted to reading and writing with spaces and institutional resources often provided for us. But when we approach the community, often we will be forced “to recall the material conditions of writing,” to remember that “we do confront such complex material questions as how to provide equality of access to computers for word processing” (Gere 87)” (14). Often, privilege impacts our scholarly activities in the academy, and this fact distances us from the communities we seek to collaborative with. The disparate realities ultimately impact not only the success of our relationships with communities but also our ability to effectively collaborate. However, Cushman offers the theory of reciprocity as a tool we may use as we attempt to engage the community: “Reciprocity includes an open and conscious negotiation of the power structures reproduced during the give-and-take interactions of the people involved on both sides of the relationship. A theory of reciprocity, then, frames this activist agenda with a self-critical, conscious navigation of this intervention” (16). Reciprocity also creates a space where we might make available to the community the resources we scholars have access to. Civic engagement activities in composition, then, are more than the way we approach the community or the pedagogy we employ in a composition class. Civic engagement is the language we use to conceptualize our relationships between the university and the community; it is creating opportunities for rhetoricians to experience perplexing dilemmas, critically reflect on their assumptions, and facilitate how to learn more than learning outcomes.

Civic engagement in rhetoric and composition also manifests in a research paradigm geared toward social change. In their 2006 article “Personal Experience Narrative and Public Debate: Writing the Wrongs of Welfare,” Lorraine Higgins and Lisa Bush outline this form of
activism. Through the use of activist research, the authors give voice to a subordinated group in society that is seldom heard in public debate. Higgins and Brush discuss a community writing project where welfare recipients use personal narrative in order to make their “tacit and frequently discounted knowledge” public (694). In order to do this, the authors argue that a counterhegemonic public must be created. “A counterhegemonic public is a separate rhetorical (and often literal) “safe space” for building and expressing identities, analyses, solidarity, leadership skills, and other basic social movement capacities. But as a public, not simply an enclave, a counterhegemonic public is a stance from which subordinated agents aspire to connect and disseminate their perspectives to ever-wider publics” (695). Rhetoric provides the myriad ways to constitute the counterhegemonic public. According to Higgins and Brush, the work of activist rhetoricians implies the five dimensions of activist research:

- First, activist rhetoricians provide venues in which marginalized or subordinated people can share and disseminate their perspectives through talk and text. Second, they observe and describe obstacles to the work of subordinated rhetors, including the ways dominant discursive practices limit their rhetorical agency and public participation. Third, they provide capital (material, social, cultural, or other resources) for subordinated rhetors to pursue self-determined communicative agendas (Cushman, “Rhetorician” 14–16; Struggle). Fourth, activist rhetoricians develop and teach rhetorical strategies for expressing local knowledge and connecting it to larger arguments and audiences. Fifth and finally, they reflect on outcomes of their work in order to contribute simultaneously to social change and rhetorical theory. (696)

Higgins and Brush’s five dimensions not only outline activism that benefits the subordinated but also summarize civic engagement activities broadly within the field. Rhetoric is naturally a
venue for scholars and communities to share and disseminate perspectives; it observes and
describes the obstacles to the work of engaged rhetors; it provides capital for engaged
department and community partnerships; it is a pedagogy for developing rhetorically engaged
strategies for expressing knowledge and connecting it to larger arguments and audiences; and
finally, engaged rhetors reflect on their work to contribute to social change and rhetorical theory.

Current Rhetoric and Composition Doctoral Student Preparation

“[G]raduate students […] implicitly learn a stance toward the world through their acquisition of
theoretical knowledge. But this is not the same as teaching students to use theoretical knowledge
to take a stance toward the world and toward the people who inhabit it […] [or] preparing
students to take stances supported by theoretical knowledge and encouraged by the ethics of the
profession. We need to consider more explicitly the connections of knowledge and stance so that
we might better understand, and so act on, doctoral education […] as, somehow, oriented to the
world ethically and normatively as well as cognitively.” (Marback 821-22)

…

Marback’s words from “Being Reasonable: A Proposal for Doctoral Education in
Composition Studies” begin this section because they capture the focus of this discussion.
Currently, doctorate programs in rhetoric and composition are grounded in classical rhetorical
traditions and essentially prepare graduate students to teach, to do research and publish, and to
engage in professional service on campus. Published research from Karen Pierce and Theresa
Enos demonstrates this in their 2007 article based on a survey of graduate curricula in rhetoric
and composition. In early fall 2004, Pierce and Enos posted a web-based survey aimed at
determining whether a core curriculum existed within the field. Overall, the authors found that
core courses are not reflective of current specializations in demand in job ads, and we also find that paper assignments in most courses are not aimed at helping students build a dossier of publications, even though expertise in these specializations and a record of publication are becoming more and more important to landing a job out of graduate school. Furthermore, in courses that focus on current specializations in the job market, there is little agreement on a core list of texts […]. (205)

The authors were not surprised by the typical core courses reported in rhetoric and composition graduate programs. The most often mentioned courses were composition theory, practices of teaching writing, history of rhetoric and rhetoric theory courses. The next most-often taught core course was research methods, and this was then followed by a cluster of courses that were least often taught. The authors also elicited feedback regarding non-core courses in the programs; interestingly enough, the responses closely mirrored the responses for the core courses. However, neither civic engagement courses nor activities were required in the core courses or encouraged in the non-core courses.

Although Pierce and Enos were not explicitly looking at whether programs had incorporated civic engagement activities, the study highlights the kind of disconnect Marback implies when he argues that doctoral programs need to teach students to use their theoretical knowledge to take a stance. The Pierce and Enos study suggests that doctoral programs are slow to respond to the changing landscape in the contemporary context. Institutional change is slow. In Built to Last, Collins and Porras argue that organizations only achieve high levels of performance over many years. Similarly, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) explains in Stepping Forward as Stewards of Place that this slow
progression is necessary because universities are “aligning all aspects of the organization to support well-defined outcomes” (7).

Over the past fifty years, research-intensive universities have evolved “to a point where all elements of the university, from faculty rewards to organizational infrastructure, reinforce the importance of externally funded research as a core institutional mission” (AASCU 8). This research is deeply rooted in higher education. Moreover, state and federal funding and incentives reinforce the research activities. Further complicating the issue, “many universities espouse the importance of public engagement but do little internally to align the institution to support achievement” (AASCU 8). This is caused because public engagement is not deeply rooted in the institution’s culture, or perhaps because a committed CEO or president has departed. “The result,” according to the AASCU, “is that public engagement remains on many campuses very fragile and person-dependent” (8). However, it takes time to embed public engagement in university culture, and it is unrealistic to expect to find well integrated in 2009 Ph.D. programs civic engagement approaches and concepts that have been talked about explicitly in higher education since about 1997 by Boyer.

Nevertheless, universities are situated within communities that have needs. Our economy is transforming, becoming technology driven. Our population is aging and diversifying. The list of needs is long. There is an obligation now more than ever to respond to those needs, and the public is looking to higher education to respond. Jacqueline Jones Royster discusses this need as well as the disconnect that seems to exist between what is taught in doctorate programs and application of this knowledge in the world in “Shifting the Paradigms of English Studies: Continuity and Change.” She argues that
[w]e need to establish curricular structures for our graduate programs in ways that acknowledge both the historical and the contemporary landscape. […] Instead, we need to assess curricular offerings critically, to actually think again about what we require and why, and whether the requirements continue to make sense in the contemporary context. […] [W]e must convey to our students the complex intellectual relations and projects of the field as well as our obligations to be responsive to the world around us, using what we have come to know to make that world a better place. (1227)

As Royster discusses, it is clear that programs need to reevaluate rhetoric and composition program requirements. At the same time, programs need to instill a sense of stewardship – rhetoricians have an obligation to share the material, social, cultural, or other resources with the community. “Successfully engaging in this task,” Royster writes, “means doing more than calcifying old habits as we bemoan a constrained job market” (1227). However, this is no small task as most graduate programs’ rationales seem entrenched in outdated practices.

Across higher education, the rationale for doctoral education program requirements is either lost in historical traditions or lack a unified vision, as Peirce and Enos discovered in their survey of graduate programs in rhetoric and composition. In fact, the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (CID), which involved eighty-four Ph.D.-granting departments in six fields including English, found that “students may well not understand why certain elements are required or toward what end, and faculty, if pushed, will acknowledge that there is no unified vision underpinning many of the experiences students are expected to complete” (Walker, Golde, Jones, Bueschel, and Hutchings 5). According to the CID findings, faculty members feel overwhelmed by competing demands, such as scholarship, fund raising, teaching, community engagement, and personal life. Doctoral students feel similarly: “doctoral students […] often feel burdened by
debts, exploited as lab technicians or low-paid instructors, and disillusioned by the disgruntlement of overworked faculty mentors” (5).

However, “[t]he landscape of doctoral education,” according to the 2005 Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation’s report titled *The Responsive Ph.D.: Innovations in U.S. Doctoral Education* “has changed substantially for the better” (1). In the early 1990s, national studies and projects found a “mismatch between the kinds of training Ph.D.s receive in graduate school and the careers available to them” (1). In response to reports such as the CID findings, the foundation and its 14 participating universities identified four themes and then structured a small number of recommendations (which will be discussed later in Chapter Four) to develop innovative programs that demonstrated those themes. Three of those themes are integral to re-visioning rhetoric and composition graduate student preparation so that it involves more explicit engagement training. The foundation structured its recommendations on the following themes: new paradigms, new practices, and new partnerships. Scholarship is at the heart of rhetoric and composition doctoral programs and it should not be viewed as the enemy when promoting writing in society. The Woodrow Wilson report argues that “We should never apologize for pushing back the night” in regards to scholarly practice (3). Research in general serves the public good, as Austin and Barnes, in their chapter 2005 chapter “Preparing Students for Faculty Careers that Contribute to the Public Good,” state by “expanding human knowledge or by adding new elements of basic knowledge that advance science, medicine or other fields” (280). Under the first theme, then, of new paradigms, graduate education needs to encourage “adventurous scholarship,” rather than implicating scholarship as the enemy when attempting to promote more fully engaged doctoral education (Woodrow Wilson 3).
By new practices, the Woodrow Wilson report argues that all aspects of doctoral training, including pedagogy, should be truly developmental. In other words, graduate preparation should “seek ways to make the application of knowledge beyond the academy integral to the doctoral experience” (3). This includes research, teaching, and other forms of experiences, such as intern- and externships. This theme leads to the third theme central to this discussion – new partnerships. The Woodrow Wilson report explains that this theme “seeks an essential and continuous relationship between those who create the doctoral process and all those who employ its graduates” (3). I would also argue that these new partnerships should also seek a continuing exchange between community programs and organizations and specific doctoral programs, such as rhetoric and composition. New partnerships would require programs to explicitly open up and “engage social challenges more generously” in doctoral student preparation (5). This theme is especially important as most doctoral students are gaining teaching experience by working as, for example, first year composition instructors. In order to be competitive, new faculty members need to be prepared as competent writing instructors and scholars for a career that requires more public engagement.

Although writing instruction preparation may not be an explicit component of rhetoric and composition doctoral student preparation, it is yet another competing demand that doctoral students are overwhelmed by. Rhetoric and composition doctoral student teacher training has developed to “complex, formal programs at the beginning of the twenty-first century in which TAs learn to teach writing in various settings” (Pytlik xvi). This teaching demand is complicated by the traditional department’s view, which according to Amanda Brobbel et al, “holds that graduate students are hired hands, duespayers on the lowest rung of the university ladder” (Diogenes, Roen, and Swearingen qtd in Brobbel 411).
Rhetoric and composition doctoral education needs to be “thinking about more than strategies for teaching and administering writing,” Thomas P. Miller asserts in “Why Don’t Our Graduate Programs Do a Better Job of Preparing Students for the Work that We Do?” Similarly, Richard Gebhardt also discusses the dissatisfaction with the present state of doctoral programs in “Reviewing and Refocusing Doctoral Education in Composition Studies” but claims that these issues “serve as a context for review of doctoral education and for refocusing the composition Ph.D.” (160). Miller asserts that “[w]e need to expand our frame of reference beyond the internal workings of composition programs. […] If we adopt a civic stance on graduate studies, we may be able to place graduates in positions where they can use their leadership skills beyond as well as within departments of English” (55). Ph.D. education in composition inculcated with civic engagement principles would transform how we prepare graduate students:

Faculty and students would explicitly concern themselves with developing an understanding of how the broader concerns of a larger public enable and constrain research supported practices. In light of this understanding, they would concentrate on creating narratives that persuasively justify research-based action to broader publics. They would also focus on crafting research claims within composition studies that take account of public imperatives. The goal is to enable students to discern and represent to a range of audiences the greater common good served by composition research. (Marback 839)

Although civic engagement is clearly supported in a wide range of scholarship, critiques of graduate student training indicate that rhetoric and composition Ph.D. programs need to be refocused or transformed as Gebhard discusses. In “Educating “Community Intellectuals”: Rhetoric, Moral Philosophy, and Civic Engagement,” Michelle Eble and Lynee Gaillet
encourage programs “to take on the challenge of educating students to become ‘community intellectuals,’” because the “notion of educating future professionals for a career [is being] reconsidered in light of both current research concerning civic rhetoric and past practices in moral humanism” (341). Boyer points out that “abundant evidence shows that both the civic and academic health of any culture is vitally enriched as scholars and practitioners speak and listen carefully to each other” (145). Although Boyer’s article “Scholarship of Engagement” was written in 1995, Boyer’s challenge still applies over a decade later to contemporary education in rhetoric and composition.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have explored a range of published scholarship to establish exigency for this dissertation study. The discussion began with the central research question: How are rhetoric and composition programs preparing graduate students to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers? To begin to answer this question, I focused on several theoretical frameworks. I defined three key civic terms: service-learning, civic engagement, and scholarship of engagement. Although rhetoric and composition includes a wide range of service-learning and scholarship of engagement activities, my study focuses on broad civic engagement/engaged efforts. It is clear that rhetoric and composition has a legacy of civic functions that have persisted in contemporary higher education and rhetoric and composition scholarship. However, the Pierce and Enos study of rhetoric and composition doctoral student education does not point to any civic engagement preparation. In fact, national studies from higher education in general, such as the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate findings and the Woodrow Wilson report The Responsive Ph.D., argue that doctoral education should “promote public scholarship that applies academic expertise to social challenges” (Woodrow Wilson Foundation “Executive Summary”
1). Many rhetoric and composition scholars argue for transforming rhetoric and composition doctoral student education. Some argue that the one way to do this is by embedding public engagement in the fabric of rhetoric and composition programs.

The appropriateness of studying civic engagement activities in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs is quite clear and provides the basis for the pilot study involving the 70 Rhetoric and Composition Doctoral Programs in the United States as listed on the Doctoral Consortium in Rhetoric and Composition site. “Chapter Three: Overview of the Study” provides an overview of the goals for this project, methodology, research questions, and limitations of the pilot study.
Chapter Three: Overview of the Study

Introduction

Chapter Two established the theoretical framework for this dissertation by exploring textual scholarship. Existing literature reveals rhetoric and composition’s legacy of civic engagement, but it does not show that rhetoric and composition doctoral programs prepare students for civic engagement in their future faculty lives. This lack of evidence in published scholarship is not surprising given the fact that the current civic engagement movement is, at the time of this writing, perhaps eighteen years old. But it points to the need for more investigation of civic engagement preparation in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs. This qualitative descriptive pilot study hopes to ascertain what rhetoric and composition Ph.D. programs are doing to prepare students for faculty work that contributes to the public good.

The study focuses on broad civic engagement efforts. The term “civic engagement”, according to The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges’ (NASULGC) Kellogg Commission, can involve a faculty member’s “teaching, research, and extension and service functions” where they are “sympathetically and productively involved with their communities, however community may be defined” (NASULGC 27). Are rhetoric and composition doctoral programs preparing students for such civic engagement in their future teaching, research and service? That question stands behind this dissertation and the pilot study described in this chapter.

My study of rhetoric and composition Ph.D. education consists of two surveys: the 2007 *Rhetoric Review* of course offerings of the curricula of 67 doctoral Rhetoric and Composition Programs and my questionnaire distributed to directors of the 70 rhetoric and composition doctoral programs in the United States as listed on the website of the Doctoral Consortium in
Rhetoric and Composition. The primary objectives of this study are to describe current emphases on engagement as a basis for drawing conclusions about how civic engagement preparation for engaged faculty work may be enhanced in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs.

This chapter discusses in detail the research questions and methodology of the study, including the programs, variables, data collection instrument, and limitations involved.

Research Questions

The following research questions were developed in order to establish exigency for the pilot study and to make a case for how engagement can be better incorporated into rhetoric and composition graduate education:

1. What is the field of rhetoric and composition’s historical connection to civic engagement?

2. What civic engagement preparation for engaged faculty work is taking place in higher education and rhetoric and composition?

3. What are the main characteristics of the professional preparation of students in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs?

4. How do rhetoric and composition graduate programs define civic engagement and how might this impact the incorporation of civic engagement initiatives within doctoral programs?

5. How are rhetoric and composition graduate programs preparing graduate students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?
6. How might rhetoric and composition doctoral program incorporate and/or promote civic engagement in graduate student preparation?

7. How might civic engagement preparation for engaged faculty work change our understanding of graduate student preparation and faculty scholarship?

I raised the first three questions for background and to justify civic engagement preparation as a significant area for my overall research. In Chapter Two, review of existing literature addressed these three questions. This was important because the answers to the first two questions addressed the longstanding civic engagement trend within higher education and rhetoric and composition while at the same time exploring current definitions of civic engagement. Question three, current practices for preparing graduate students in rhetoric and composition to join the professoriate, is especially important. Chapter Two addressed this question and helped to situate the divide between current practice and the incorporation of civic engagement preparation. Review of existing literature served as a foundation not only for establishing graduate student preparation trends but also justified the research project overall. The question also is addressed by information discovered in the pilot study that is reported in Chapter Four.

The final four questions are most directly relevant to the pilot study itself. Questions 4 and 5 touched on existing research and are addressed explicitly by my questionnaire results. The results, which will be discussed in detail in Chapter Four, situate current definitions of civic engagement and how civic engagement preparation is being implemented in the rhetoric and composition doctoral programs. Questions 6 and 7 relate most directly to my conclusions and recommendations. The questions explore the practical application of civic engagement preparation in graduate student preparation in specific rhetoric and composition programs.
These two questions guided not only my library research but also my pilot study research, and in answering them I have created a thick description of how institutions prepare graduate students to do civic engagement. These findings will be discussed in detail in Chapter Four. In Chapter Five, I will provide recommendations based on my research as to how rhetoric and composition doctoral programs can become more fully engaged, and I will then argue how this better prepares rhetoric and composition graduate students for future faculty work.

I see the proposed research questions working together to answer the overall question and focus of this project. Furthermore, in answering these questions, it seems important to study not only how programs are incorporating civic engagement at the doctorate level, but also how other institutions might begin to incorporate such civic engagement preparation for engaged faculty work. Looking at how these changes may affect graduate student preparation, instructor training, and faculty assessment are equally important questions to answer and will be addressed in Chapter Five.

Theoretical Framework for Methods and Methodology

“Our interest in writing is inseparable from our interest in social conditions within which people write, the social purposes they use writing for, and how writing fits in with their life histories, all of which define writing itself. We are also interested in how writing is implicated in power relations, both those involved in the daily lives of people and those among people and the dominant institutions of our society. We are interested in how writing is used to establish identities and to transform social situations and relationships.” (Sheridan, Street and Bloome qtd. in Schultz 360)
I begin with this quote from Katherine Schultz’s chapter “Qualitative Research on Writing” in *Handbook of Writing Research* because she captures my interest in this dissertation. I am interested in how Rhetoric and Writing graduate students are being prepared for civic engagement – and I would argue this corresponds to Schultz’s interest in social conditions and social purposes of writing – in their future faculty work. This dissertation focuses on the education students acquire in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs, and this also impacts how they establish their scholarly identities within social contexts. The study followed a qualitative descriptive research design to examine what rhetoric and composition Ph.D. programs are doing to prepare students for faculty lives that contribute to the public good. Qualitative methods “allow for inclusion of the multiple contexts” in which rhetoric and writing graduate students are educated and “inform our understanding of [graduate preparation] as deeply situated or deeply embedded in these various contexts” (Schultz 360). Civic engagement within rhetoric and writing graduate education is the specific context this pilot study explores. A qualitative method is ideal for this project because historically it has “allowed researchers to investigate writing across contexts, including boundaries between home, school, and the community […]. Drawing from theoretical perspectives from anthropologists and linguists […], qualitative research has added a focus on language and communication in social contexts […]. Researchers have used this set of methods to examine the […] ways language is tied to social and cultural contexts (e.g. Heath, 1983; Philips, 1983; Scribner & Cole, 1981)” (Schultz 360). Specifically, a qualitative method allows me to examine the social context of rhetoric and writing graduate student education. As graduate students are being prepared for future faculty lives that involve public engagement, their scholarly work will need to cross the boundaries between the academy
and the community. A qualitative design lets me explore these aspects of their education, and selective, carefully chosen quantitative data also supports this discussion in Chapter Four.

The design for this study consists of two parts, which take place in three modes. The first part of the study establishes exigency through two modes. The first mode involved textual scholarship, through library and web-available sources. The course offerings of the curricula of 67 doctoral Rhetoric and Composition programs as reported in *Rhetoric Review* in 2007 were read and analyzed to establish any civic engagement preparation in the graduate programs. Reading as a methodological tool, according to Blakeslee and Fleischer in *Becoming a Writing Researcher*, “is usually geared more toward answering […] research questions than it is toward helping [to] define or narrow [the] [research] questions” (106). Just as Blakeslee and Fleischer assert, reading was indeed a central part of this research inquiry because it uncovered answers to the research questions, exposed different aspects, and broadened my perspectives.

The second mode of this study entailed survey-based research through my pilot study. The rationale for using a survey/questionnaire as a research method is due to the rich data they can generate. Surveys allow researchers in the field to answer a range of questions by gathering information about a larger population by questioning a smaller sample. As Lauer and Asher stress, surveys and questionnaires provide a means for researchers to learn what others are doing, thinking, or feeling about a particular subject. When using surveys, Lauer and Asher suggest, researchers should consider the following questions: who is the population, what methods were used for sampling, how were the questions theorized and written, what kind of data was collected, how many responded, and what conclusions can be drawn from the data? (Anderson et al). For this pilot study a questionnaire was developed and distributed to directors of rhetoric and composition doctoral programs. Although this project is employing survey-based techniques,
a formal questionnaire was actually developed. This distinction between a formal survey and questionnaire is important because, according to Blakeslee and Fleischer, the terms are slightly different. Questionnaires, according to the authors, “generally require less elaborate preparation and are often more open-ended in design. […] Questionnaires tend to be targeted to a smaller number of people and situated in a particular context or situation” (145). A descriptive design was used to analyze the data collected from the questionnaires.

According to Lauer and Asher, “descriptive research seeks to further develop theory because researchers are trying to isolate and explain important variables” (15). Descriptive studies involve “observation of phenomena and analysis of data with as little restructuring of the situation or environment under scrutiny as possible” (Lauer and Asher 15). Because this study did not incorporate experimental studies, no control groups were created and no treatments were given (Lauer and Asher 82). A descriptive research design was necessary for this study because my research questions require close examination and analysis of program characteristics. Richard Beach claims “[i]f the questions involve examining characteristics of or relationships between variables, then a researcher would opt for a more descriptive design” (223). As with any descriptive research, my study examined the education of rhetoric and composition student Ph.D. programs. My research is concerned with civic engagement. Description of what rhetoric and composition Ph.D. programs are doing to prepare students for faculty lives that contribute to the public good was provided based on the 2007 Rhetoric Review survey of rhetoric and composition Ph.D. curricula and my questionnaire of rhetoric and composition doctoral programs.

The second part of this research project makes a case for how engagement can better be incorporated into rhetoric and composition doctoral education. The second part also argues that
a more fully engaged program better prepares graduates for engaged faculty work. The third mode that is used, then, in this project, involves argumentation based on my research and textual scholarship from part one, as well as on the larger body of work on engagement that can be brought into the rhetoric and composition graduate educational context. The second part of this research project will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Five.

Participants

The participants for this study consist of the directors of doctoral programs in rhetoric and composition as reported in the *Rhetoric Review* data and my questionnaire. The programs offer a number of different options for obtaining a specialization in rhetoric and composition, such as Ph.D. in English with concentration, Ph.D. in Rhetoric and Composition, Ph.D. in Technical/Professional Communication, Ph.D. in English, Ph.D. in Rhetoric, or other degrees offered, which may consist of Ph.D. in English Education. Sixty-seven doctoral programs in rhetoric and composition are represented in the 2007 *Rhetoric Review* survey “Portrait of the Profession: The 2007 Survey of Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition.” The following 67 programs were included in the *Rhetoric Review* online survey:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of Alabama</th>
<th>Louisiana State University</th>
<th>Purdue University</th>
<th>Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>University of Maryland at College Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>University of Massachusetts at Amherst</td>
<td>University of Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn University</td>
<td>Miami University</td>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball State University</td>
<td>University of Michigan at Ann Arbor</td>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green State University</td>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>Southern Illinois University at Carbondale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California at Santa Barbara</td>
<td>Michigan Technological University</td>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>University of Tennessee at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For my questionnaire, I emailed the contact people of 70 rhetoric and composition doctoral programs in the United States as listed in the website of the Doctoral Consortium in Rhetoric and Composition (http://www.cws.illinois.edu/rc_consortium/index.html), and provided a link to a questionnaire available at SurveyMonkey. Sixteen directors anonymously completed the online questionnaire. In compliance with Human Subjects Review Board (HSRB) regulation, the directors’ identities are not revealed in the data reported. Programs are identified by letters that correspond to each completed questionnaire.

Variables

Most, but not all, of the 67 programs in Rhetoric Review’s 2007 survey were part of the 70 program directors I contacted in 2009. Since both curriculum and program leadership change
over time, the two surveys do not provide two views of the same subject. It is also important to consider the following external variables that may have affected the choices and outcome of the survey and questionnaire data:

Programmatic Differences

One variable is the differences in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs. In both the *Rhetoric Review* survey and my questionnaire, the doctoral programs offer many different options of specialization in rhetoric and composition. These range from a doctorate in English with concentration to a doctorate in Technical/Professional Communication. Some programs offered a Ph.D. in Rhetoric and Composition and others offered only a Ph.D. in Rhetoric. These program differences also manifest in the program mission/goals, as well as the curriculum offered. The number of different variables within each program affects the program directors’ responses to the questionnaire. So it is important to note the distinct features of the programs that may readily affect the directors’ written responses.

Different Definitions of Civic Engagement

Another variable is the difference in how programs define civic engagement. The textual scholarship in Chapter Two reveals there are a number of different ways that civic engagement is defined in rhetoric and composition, as well as higher education. The data obtained from my questionnaire further supports existing literature. Directors provided varied definitions of civic engagement. Although there were some similarities, directors varied not only in the specific diction they used to define civic engagement, but they also differed in how they envisioned civic engagement manifesting in rhetoric and composition programs. For example, some indicated in
their responses that rhetoric was inherently engaged. Because of this, they did not think the program needed to define or espouse additional civic preparation. Other directors expressed contrary views, defining a specific definition of civic engagement and providing elaborate descriptions of engagement preparation. These differences are an important variable because they impact the responses to the other questions of the questionnaire.

Differences in Questionnaire Responses

Finally, the differences in the specificity and detail that different directors used when completing the Rhetoric Review survey and my questionnaire is an important variable. In both the Rhetoric Review survey and my questionnaire, the responses varied to specific questions, and this impacted the data reported. For example, in the Rhetoric Review survey some of the programs did not report the specifics of their curriculum, while others provided detailed information about the required and optional core courses. Similarly, in my questionnaire, some programs did not elaborate on the civic engagement preparation occurring in doctoral classes, while others provided rich descriptions. These discrepancies in specificity and detail could very well be a significant variable because the differences impact the comprehensiveness of this study.

Data Collection

Because the first part of the study consists of two modes, data collection occurred at two different points in this study. Data collection in the first mode involved textual scholarship by examining the curricula offerings as reported in the 2007 Rhetoric Review Survey of Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition. In the second mode, data collection consisted of my
questionnaire. For both modes, manifestations of civic engagement were identified in nine categories, which I invented as a means of recording data:

**Table 2. “Manifestations of Civic Engagement” Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Dissertation Title/Focus Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Description/Mission Statement/Goals</td>
<td>Core Faculty Research Interest Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Prelim Exam Reading Lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Programs</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements about Program Strengths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rhetoric Review Survey*

The first source of descriptive information was the 2007 *Rhetoric Review* Survey of Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition, which represents data collected from 67 programs in the United States (http://www.u.arizona.edu/~enos/). In order to quickly get a sense of any civic engagement emphases, I reviewed the results from each program. Any language that seemed to indicate civic engagement was noted and recorded for each program. Although the *Rhetoric Review* survey wasn’t specifically looking for civic engagement, I found manifestations in the mission statement/goals/program description, curriculum, dissertation title/focus area, program strengths, and core faculty research/pedagogy areas. These findings will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter Four.

*Pilot Study Rhetoric and Writing Program Administrator Questionnaire*

The second source of information was my questionnaire. Before proceeding with participant recruitment and data collection, I went through the Human Subjects Review Board
(HSRB) application process in March 2009. In April, my application had met the conditions for approval. Data were collected over a five-week period between April 20th and May 29th in spring 2009. In order to select participants, I referred to the contact people of 70 rhetoric and composition doctoral programs in the United States as listed in the website (http://www.cws.illinois.edu/rc_consortium/index.html) of the Doctoral Consortium in Rhetoric and Composition. I emailed the contact people and provided a link to my anonymous online questionnaire on SurveyMonkey. The email invitation provided a brief description of the study, information about their benefits and rights, procedures, and a request to report anonymous responses (See Appendix A). Each participant was informed that by completing the questionnaire, they were giving permission to use their responses. The data collection period took place between the time I made initial contact via email and the time the data collection period closed on May 29th. The online questionnaire allowed participants to start and stop the questionnaire at any time, and it allowed them to return to the questionnaire at any time to make changes to responses. One week before the data collection period closed, I sent a second email to all participants to remind them they could still complete the questionnaire by May 29th. I ended my data collection by midnight May 30th.

Limitations

Certain factors in terms of the choice of data collection tools, the failure to control other variables, and the size of the sample may have limited the potentials of this study for generating thorough results. One potential limitation to this study is that the questionnaire was completed in an uncontrolled environment where there was little opportunity to clarify any questions the
participants may have had regarding the questions. Although the participants could have contacted me via email or phone if there had been any need for clarification, none did.

Another potential limitation to this study is the choice of data collection tool. According to Anderson et al, SurveyMonkey is a “limited engine [that] provide[s] little more than the percentage of respondents answering each question” (“Integrating Multimodality” 65). Anderson et al find that Zoomerang is a more effective software application. It is used by the National Council of Teachers of English, and it is free. Zoomerang provides automatic methods for filtering and tabulating data, and it offers flexibility in survey design and the reporting of survey data (Anderson et al). Nevertheless, because this is a qualitative study that focused on the individual written responses from each participant, SurveyMonkey was a good choice because of its simplicity and ease of use.

Finally, the size of the questionnaire sample may not provide holistic results because 16 out of the 70 programs responded to the online questionnaire. The 23% return rate could have been higher and would need to be in a comprehensive study. But data provided by the 16 doctoral program directors provides a good basis in this pilot study, especially because it is augmented by detailed information collected on the 67 programs in the 2007 Rhetoric Review study.

Conclusion

Chapter Three provided a broad overview of the study’s guiding research questions and methodology of the pilot study, including the programs, variables, data collection instrument, and limitations involved. As discussed earlier, this study consists of two parts, which take place in three modes. The first part of the study establishes exigency through two modes. The first
mode involved textual scholarship where the curricula of 67 doctoral Rhetoric and Composition programs as reported in *Rhetoric Review* in 2007 were analyzed. The second mode of this study entailed survey-based research in my pilot study where I developed and distributed a questionnaire to directors of rhetoric and composition doctoral programs (as listed on the Doctoral Consortium of Rhetoric and Composition site). The qualitative methodology allows me to examine the social and cultural context (Schultz) of rhetoric and composition graduate student preparation for faculty work that contributes to the public good. By using a descriptive design to analyze the data, I am able to observe phenomena and analyze data without restructuring the situation I am scrutinizing, according to Lauer and Asher. This analysis is further supported by selective, carefully chosen quantitative data.

Chapter Four, then, will present my findings and analyze specific patterns that emerge from the individual questionnaires and the *Rhetoric Review* survey. Although the sample is small, the data provide a strong foundation for future research on this topic. I will describe the main highlights of the findings in a concluding summary at the end of the chapter. These findings provide the basis for Chapter Five where the second part of this research project will be discussed in greater detail.
Chapter Four: Study Findings and Analysis

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to address the fourth and fifth research questions discussed in Chapter Three:

How do rhetoric and composition graduate programs define civic engagement and how might this impact the incorporation of civic engagement initiatives within doctoral programs?

How are rhetoric and composition graduate programs preparing graduate students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?

In order to answer these research questions, data collection occurred in two modes. Data collection in the first mode involved textual scholarship by examining the curricula offerings as reported in the 2007 *Rhetoric Review* Survey of the 67 Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition in the United States. The programs reported in the survey were identified in Chapter Three (Table 1, page 52). In the second mode, data collection consisted of my pilot study, titled *Rhetoric and Writing Program Administrator Questionnaire*, where I contacted the directors of 70 rhetoric and composition doctoral programs in the United States as listed in the website of the Doctoral Consortium in Rhetoric and Composition. Although many of the programs listed on the consortium site were also reported in the *Rhetoric Review* survey, my questionnaire responses do not necessarily correspond to the same universities listed within that survey. Because directors’ responses were anonymous, it is not possible to infer that these correspond to specific schools listed previously in Chapter Three. For both modes, manifestations of civic engagement were identified in the following categories based on themes that emerged from participants’ (i.e. directors of Doctoral Rhetoric and Composition Programs) responses:
Table 2. “Manifestations of Civic Engagement” Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Dissertation Title/Focus Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Description/Mission Statement/Goals</td>
<td>Core Faculty Research Interest Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Civic Engagement</td>
<td>Prelim Exam Reading Lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside Programs</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements about Program Strengths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rhetoric Review* 2007 Survey of Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition

In order to get a sense of any civic engagement emphases or preparation, I reviewed the reports from all 67 programs, noting and recording any language that seemed to indicate civic engagement. Overall, programs provided general information on the program description/mission statements, core faculty research/pedagogy areas, recent graduates and their dissertations, quantity and areas of dissertation since 2000, job placement since 2005/06 graduation, admissions, curriculum, financial support and professional development, and program challenges and strengths. The full report of this survey, including results for particular programs, conducted by Brown, Enos, Reamer and Thompson can be found at http://www.u.arizona.edu/~enos/.

Because the survey was conducted in order to “to provide students interested in pursuing doctoral study in rhetoric and composition with a current and comprehensive guide to programs in the field” – in other words, it wasn’t specifically looking for civic engagement – data I collected from this survey did not explicitly answer my fourth research question, which speculated how programs define civic engagement and how this impacts the incorporation of
engagement initiatives. However, I did find manifestations of civic engagement in the mission statements/ goals/ program descriptions, curriculum, dissertation title/focus area, program strengths, and core faculty research/pedagogy areas. Because of this, the data in these five categories did imply a possible working definition of engagement while explicitly addressing how programs do or do not prepare students to practice civic engagement as future faculty. Of the 67 programs, 27 (or roughly 40%) demonstrated or indicated civic engagement encouragement or at least awareness. Table 3 represents which programs showed some form of civic engagement in the five categories already mentioned. Each category and the program data will be discussed in greater detail below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Statements about Program Strengths</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Dissertation Title/Focus Area</th>
<th>Program Description/ Mission Statement/ Goals</th>
<th>Core Faculty Research/ Pedagogy Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Alabama</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Arizona</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Santa Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Western University</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemson University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If a culture of engagement is to be nurtured in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs, then engagement must operate within distinct dimensions, such as the five categories around which Table 3 is organized. These categories are similar to ones that Andy Furco has developed in a rubric that institutions committed to embedding service learning (one aspect of engagement) throughout their campus may follow. Furco identifies five key factors, and I argue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of PA</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska – Lincoln</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of North Carolina at Greensboro</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Tennessee, Knoxville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M University – Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Tech</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
these factors can also act as a road map for institutionalizing civic engagement in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs: (a) philosophy and mission; (b) faculty support and involvement; (c) student support and involvement; (d) community participation and partnerships; and (e) institutional support. The 27 programs identified in Table 3 clearly demonstrate the institutionalization of civic engagement in the dimensions Furco outlines. Because of this, I argue that, even though the Rhetoric Review survey wasn’t specifically researching civic engagement, the data collected from the survey is significant. It clearly identifies the state of affairs on engagement preparation in doctoral rhetoric and composition programs.

Mirroring the Furco dimensions is a statement about how institutions may commit to engagement growing out of a 2004 Wingspread Conference held in Racine, Wisconsin. The Wingspread participants, 41 leaders and practitioners from engaged institutions nationwide, believe that “engagement is the best hope for the future of higher education” (Brukardt et al ii). And they pose the following question in their 2004 statement: “Is higher education ready to commit to engagement?” (Brukardt et al ii). Naturally, this is a challenge, rather than a question, for higher education and rhetoric and composition programs to attend to. The Wingspread statement identifies six specific practices that can also help institutionalize civic engagement. These practices are “[i]ntegrate engagement into mission”; “[f]orge partnerships as the overarching framework for engagement”; “[r]enew and redefine discovery and scholarship”; “[i]ntegrate engagement into teaching and learning”; “[r]ecruit and support new champions [in faculty and student body]”; and “[c]reate radical institutional change” (iii). As the following five sub-sections show, the 27 programs are committing to engagement in ways similar to the six Wingspread practices.
Program Description/ Mission Statement/Goals

I begin the discussion of data findings from the *Rhetoric Review* survey with the program description, mission statement and goals because this is where prospective students are first introduced to a program and its focus. The mission statement is where a rhetoric and composition doctoral program directly communicates its philosophy and intended learning outcomes to prospective students. The mission or program description is also one of the dimensions where, according to Furco and the Wingspread participants, programs may articulate their civic engagement commitment. According to the American Association of State Colleges and Universities Task Force on Public Engagement (AASCU), fully engaged programs are characterized by having “[m]ission statements that identify […] and highlight the importance of public engagement” (19). Of the 27 programs listed in Table 3, 13 (or 48%) had program descriptions, mission statements or goals that clearly indicated a commitment to civic engagement. After reviewing these statements, five themes emerged based on how specific programs articulated this concern. Although I do not discuss all 13 programs, the responses have been organized below according to the following themes: Social Context of Discourse Production; Intersection of Scholarship, Teaching and Service; Citizenship/Political Focus; and Community Outreach.

Social Context of Discourse Production:

The programs that seemed to best fit into this theme contained program descriptions or mission statements that indicated a focus on the social context of discourse production. By social context, I refer to mission statements that identify the importance of service or relationships to a narrowly defined area, because it is that region “from where [the program’s] students come, to where their graduates return, and where the greatest partnership opportunities
lie” (AASCU 19). A clear example of this is evident in the description of the Ph.D. program in Rhetoric at Carnegie Mellon University. It states that the program “focuses on how people produce and understand discourse across a variety of social, cultural, and material contexts, in schools, workplaces, and communities.” Another strong example of the social context of discourse linked to civic engagement commitments in a program’s mission statement is the description from the rhetoric and composition program at Florida State University, which states that it “focuses more specifically on social practices and theories of composing and composition, emphasizing relationships among texts […], technologies and literacies. […] [and studies] rhetorical depictions of and practices connected to the contemporary public sphere.” By emphasizing discourse production in social contexts, these programs are clearly devoted to building expertise in their graduates who will then be able to collaborate with local community partners. This collaboration will be based on “reasons that have their roots in history, culture and/or economics” (AASCU 19).

Social context is also discussed as social practice. For example, Kent State’s mission statement focuses on “Literacy, Rhetoric, and Social Practice.” By social practice, they refer to the embeddedness of literacy and rhetoric within larger discursive and material contexts of human activity. Grounded in rhetoric and language study, coursework and research center on how advanced literacy is embedded within and constitutive of communities of work and citizenship in contemporary culture. Kent’s mission statement emphasizes the “embeddedness of […] rhetoric within larger discursive and material contexts,” and I understand this to mean that the faculty are contextualizing student preparation broadly so that academic and non-academic concerns are incorporated into the learning outcomes. Non-academic concerns could be regional information
– its demographics, economics, quality of life – and indicate that the program’s planning encompasses information about the region as a formal part of its development process. Finally, social context is referenced generally by some programs. The University of California mission statement indicates that the program connects students with interests that range from “Literacy Development” to “Writing in Society.” On the other hand, the University of Oregon emphasizes that it encourages its students to focus dissertation topics on a range of options, including “community literacy.” Finally, Wayne State emphasizes that students study “writing in the community.” Writing in society, community literacy, and writing in the community are just variations in articulating the social context of rhetorical studies, ultimately indicating engaged preparation.

Intersection of Scholarship, Teaching and Service:

The second theme that emerged in the program mission statements articulates the intersection of scholarship, teaching and service. In a 2008 presentation, Dr. Robert Bringle, Director of the Center for Service and Learning at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, emphasized that “teaching, research, and service in [and with] the community” must occur when a program commits to engagement. Civic engagement is active because it involves learning from constituencies and then analyzing the capacity to serve or impact the community; it requires commitment and the capacity to engage and provide assistance. This reciprocity can occur in specific student activities – scholarship, teaching and service. Three programs’ mission statements clearly fit this theme. In fact, Michigan State University’s program description inspired the title for this category because it best captures the theme’s focus on theory, action and commitment to service. It states that
Because our program emphasizes rhetoric not only as theoretical engagement but also as productive action, we envision many sites of practice as appropriate for “doing rhetoric”: communities, classrooms, workplaces, cultures [...]. Our sense of professional identity extends to a commitment to service to our department, institutions, professional organizations, and communities. Students in our program are encouraged to envision their work as taking place at the intersections of scholarship, teaching and service within a range of linguistically and culturally diverse contexts.

By situating the mission within a broad range of contexts, MSU’s program description also touches on one of the four themes argued by The Carnegie Foundation (Walker et al) in The Formation of Scholars. They propose change in the principles of student formation espoused by doctorate programs. A guiding principle necessary for student formation, the Foundation argues, is the “integration across contexts and arenas of scholarly work” (5). The MSU program description demonstrates this integration. Engagement within their rhetoric program is the scholarly arena, and this occurs in the research work of graduate students, in the classrooms where they teach, and in their service to the community.

Another program that indicates an active theme where scholarship, teaching and service intersect is the University of North Carolina. That program’s mission statement states that they “strive to maintain its excellence in teaching, in research and creative activity, and in service to the College, University, profession and community.” Similar to the Carnegie Foundation guiding principle discussed above, UNC emphasizes the formation of doctoral students through integration across contexts of broadly defined scholarly work. This fits the definition of civic engagement used in this research project. In Chapter Two, I expanded the NASULGC Kellogg Commission definition of civic engagement by defining it as the utilization of the field’s
intellectual resources, from teaching, scholarship, and extension and service functions, for the immediate and broad community in which it is situated. These programs demonstrate this within this theme. A final example of this is apparent in Virginia Tech’s mission statement, which states that the aim of the Ph.D. in Rhetoric and Writing [...] is to educate scholars and practitioners of Rhetoric, Composition Studies, and Professional Writing who will serve the public interest by cultivating, generating, and contributing to the knowledge that constitutes these disciplines with rigor and creativity.

The focus on educating students to be scholars and practitioners who will serve the public upon graduation underscores how programs may integrate across contexts as the Carnegie Foundation proposes.

*Citizenship/Political Focus:*

One argument for incorporating civic engagement in higher education states that it “promotes civic responsibility” and encourages “student development” (Bringle). Good citizenship, according to Bringle who references Battistoni, is or involves “civic professionalism, social responsibility, social justice, connected knowing: ethic of care, public leadership, the public intellectual, and engaged/public scholarship.” This emphasis on citizenship and/or politics emerged in some of the 27 programs’ mission statements. Programs in this category explicitly state that their aim is to foster citizenship or focus on the political use of texts.

Michigan State University also fits in this category because the program states that “[o]ur aim is to prepare students to be culturally and technologically engaged thinkers, writers, researchers, teachers, and citizens.” Similarly, the University of North Carolina also directly links their program with concerns of citizenship when they write that “[i]n our view no skills are more
crucial to our students’ development toward their role as citizens in our nation and world, […] than the cognitive and communicative skills made available to them through English Studies programs […]” One instance where rhetorical theory concerns itself within civic contexts is through epideictic discourse. Today, writes Cynthia Sheard in “The Public Value of Epideictic Rhetoric,” epideictic discourse “operates in contexts civic, professional or occupational, pedagogical and so on that invite individuals to evaluate the communities or institutions to which they belong, their own roles within them, and the roles and responsibilities of their fellow constituents […]” (771). And these programs are clearly invoking such contemporary, civic engagement concerns in their mission statements by, once again, focusing on the interdependence of the individual/ doctoral student and the community.

Two other programs emphasizing the recurrent theme of contemporary and classical epideictic – that is, the emphasis of citizenship and the interdependence of the scholar and the public – are Kent and Wayne State Universities. Kent’s program description calls attention to the fact that it is “[g]rounded in rhetoric and language study, coursework and research [and] centers on how advanced literacy is embedded within and constitutive of communities of work and citizenship in contemporary culture.” Finally, Wayne State University rounds out this theme because of its explicit political focus: “Faculty and students study the ways people learn to read and write; the social, cognitive, and affective influences on this learning process; and the various uses, including cultural and political, of written and spoken texts.”

Community Outreach:

The final theme that emerged in the program mission statements centered on community outreach. By discussing community outreach, programs provided yet another example of how they are committed to preparing graduate students to incorporate civic engagement in their future
careers. Community outreach is especially important because AASCU argues that successful integration of civic engagement in programs is characterized by engaging “external constituents” (35). This is accomplished by connecting with the “citizens of the region […] and identify[ing] [particular issues] that need concerted action” (35). A few of the 27 programs clearly emphasize the importance of working within the community and addressing the particular issues of a community or region. For example, the University of Arizona states that it views rhetoric and composition as an art that

must be studied and practiced in the context of broad cultural and public interests. […] Our work on writing program administration and curriculum development is informed by our commitment to addressing issues of difference in equality and our outreach to the community. Our outreach efforts have taken us to local schools, reservations, community literacy centers, and advocacy groups.

Similarly, Georgia State aims to educate students through “teaching and administrative preparation and practical experience in the classroom, Writing Studio, electronic environments, and community internships.” The community internships that Georgia State emphasizes exhibit yet another form of engaging external constituents and indicate the commitment to engaged action in a specific community or region.

Core Faculty Research/ Pedagogy Areas

The next area I explored from the Rhetoric Review survey revealed the civic concerns in the core faculty research and pedagogy areas. Faculty support and involvement is essential when embedding civic engagement in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs (Furco). Not only will the faculty become the new champions, as the Wingspread statement asserts, who will recruit likeminded students, but they will also renew and redefine scholarship and integrate
engagement into the teaching and learning requirements within the program. Manifestations of engagement in the curriculum will be discussed later in this chapter. Sixteen of the 27 programs (nearly 60%) employed faculty who explicitly stated that some form of civic engagement was central to their research and pedagogy. This typically manifested as “Community Literacy,” “Civic Discourse,” “Public Discourse,” “Outreach,” and “Political Discourse.” Language that could imply civic engagement concerns emerged as “Rhetoric of Sustainability,” “Social Theory,” “Problem-based learning,” “Critical Pedagogy,” “Rural Literacies,” and “Teacher Research.”

The data collected is significant because most individuals are hired with a specific understanding that they will be evaluated based on teaching and advising responsibilities, research and publications, and professional service, which typically indicates service to the program or university by serving on committees (AASCU). In most universities, civic engagement is not a significant part of rhetoric and composition faculty members’ jobs, nor is it evaluated in job performance necessarily (ASSCU). However, the Rhetoric Review data reveals that faculty in doctoral rhetoric and composition programs have re-visioned their work so that civic engagement is a significant part of the job – just as a significant number of the programs’ mission statements also indicate that civic engagement is a significant part of the doctoral students’ work. Although individual rhetoric and composition programs are stronger, as Gebhardt asserts, “because faculty and students work (developing courses, selecting new students, interacting in seminars, developing dissertations) within a common context (“Reviewing” 166); I would argue that the programs are stronger because faculty and students work within a civic engagement context.
Embedding engagement within the rhetoric and composition doctoral curriculum is essential because of the proven affects on students. According to Dwight Giles and Janet Eyler, An increase in social responsibility is one of the most consistent findings. Students are more likely to see themselves as connected to their community, to value service, to endorse systematic approaches to social problems, to believe that communities can solve their problems, and to have greater racial tolerance when involved in [civic engagement]. (“Service Learning Research Agenda” 66)

Furthermore, as Furco argues, student support and involvement is imperative when attempting to embed engagement in higher education, and one way to achieve this support is through exposure and practice within the curriculum. After reviewing the curricula of the 27 programs, five programs (nearly 19%) reported course titles that indicated an engagement focus. Those programs are the University of Alabama, University of California, Santa Barbara, Case Western, Michigan State University, and University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Interestingly enough, the engaged courses were listed in the selection of pedagogical and special topic courses (electives). None of the required courses indicated any civic engagement focus.

Certain course titles in the selection of pedagogical and special topics courses clearly indicated an engaged focus in the pedagogy. For example, the University of Alabama and Michigan State University curricula require a selection of pedagogical and special-topic courses that may include “Community Literacy” or “Democracy and Literacy.” Other courses’ titles were not as clearly marked but may possibly indicate a civic or engaged focus, such as with the University of California, Santa Barbara’s course titled “Applied Rhetoric.” Similarly, Case Western offers a special topics course titled “Rhetorics of Health and Illness.” Although neither
course explicitly indicates civic engagement taking place, it can be argued that the courses link rhetoric with social issues, and this is where we situate the engagement. The same could be argued with the University of North Carolina at Greensboro’s special topic courses “Literacy, Learning and Fieldwork” and “Political Rhetoric.” Based on the course titles, the content and focus of the course may connect rhetoric with public concerns, and by doing so, prepare doctoral students to link scholarship in civic engagement and rhetoric to future faculty careers.

Dissertation Title/Focus Area

Whereas faculty may, through the curriculum, foster the student’s intellectual experience with engagement, the data reported on the dissertation title and focus area is where students demonstrate support of and involvement with engagement in rhetorical concerns through action research or through other forms, such as scholarship of engagement. It was difficult to determine whether engagement had been an integral part of the research project because I did not have access to the dissertations. But by relying on broad definitions of civic engagement, I looked for research titles that focused on rhetoric in society or that linked rhetoric with social issues. I infer, then, based on the title, that faculty have supported students’ engaged research. As Table 3 indicates, 18 of the 27 programs (nearly 67%) encouraged doctoral students to research and write dissertations about engagement concerns.

Some dissertation titles clearly indicate a civic engagement focus because of key words that identified a social context. Some of these words include but are not limited to “community,” “citizenship,” “service learning,” “community-literacy,” “civic participation,” and “activism.” The following dissertation titles, then, clearly indicate a civic engagement focus:

“Writing from the Inside Out: Connecting Self and Community in the First-year Writing Classroom.”
“Producing Good Citizens: Literacy and Citizenship Training in Anxious Times.”

“Reconceptualizing Service Learning in Composition Classes.”

“Activist Literacy: Engaging Democracy in the Classroom and Community.”

“Composing Compassionate Selves: Using Service-Learning to Move Students from a Place of Conflict to a Place of Resolution.”

“Rhetoric, Writing, and Civic Participation: A Community-Literacy Approach to College Writing Instruction.”

“Professional Publics/Private Citizens: Human Rights NGOs and the Sponsoring of Discursive Activism.”

“Does Community-Based Pedagogy Foster Critical Consciousness?”

After reviewing the titles, it was clear that programs were encouraging students to link rhetoric with civic engagement issues (as noted above). So, I began to look for themes in what students were researching based on the dissertation titles. I was reminded of Thomas Deans’ Writing Partnerships: Service-Learning in Composition where he wrote about first year composition students participating in service learning activities by writing about, for and with the community. I began to notice that some titles clearly indicated a dissertation written about a community issue or concern; for example, “‘Disabling Discourses’: Disability Identity in Institutional Texts.” Other titles seemed to indicate the dissertation was written for a community, as is the case with “Listening to the Language of Sex Workers: An Analysis of Street Sex Worker Representations and Their Effects on Sex Workers and Society.” Finally, dissertation titles indicated they were written with the community. In fact, the dissertation seemed to indicate face to face contact. This can be seen with “A Retrospective Interview Study of Literacy Sponsorship and First Generation Latino College Writers.”
What became most apparent as I combed through dissertation titles was AASCU’s assertion that civic engagement in higher education, and specifically rhetoric and composition, actually means “public engagement with external constituencies” (9) Public engagement is a “direct, two-way interaction with communities and other external constituencies through the development, exchange, and application of knowledge, information, and expertise for mutual benefit” (AASCU 9); all of which, I might add, can be further explored and pursued by doctoral students in their faculty careers. In this case, the dissertation titles reported in the Rhetoric Review survey indicate doctoral students developing knowledge, exchanging and applying information, and exchanging expertise with community sites. Sometimes the exchange was direct where the student’s research could be applied because the title indicated technical assistance. In other cases, it was clear that the exchange was indirect where students discussed issues of, and perhaps suggested strategies toward, public concern. Rather than generally grouping titles by whether they write about, for, or with the community, I’ve grouped them according to three specific themes inspired by the AASCU criteria for encouraging civic engagement. These themes and the dissertation titles that correspond are listed below and then discussed in length later.

Title indicates applied research designed to help increase understanding of a problem and/or test solutions for that problem:

“Listening to the Language of Sex Workers: An Analysis of Street Sex Worker Representations and Their Effects on Sex Workers and Society.”

“Toward a Rhetoric of Engineering: Explorations in the Practices of Engineers and the
Implications for the Teaching of Technical Communications.”

“Medicalized Illiteracies: Learning Disabilities, Contentious Histories, and Writing Studies.”

“A Qualitative Study That Investigates the Literacy Experiences of Immigrant English Language Learners in U.S. High Schools.”

“Telling Developments: Narrative Interviews with Writers as ‘Acts of Meaning.’”

Title indicates technical assistance involving the direct application of graduate student expertise in order to address a problem or understand a phenomenon:

“A Retrospective Interview Study of Literacy Sponsorship and First Generation Latino College Writers.”

“Nation and Ethnicity in Everyday Lives of Immigrants: Toward a Rhetorical Approach to Identity.”

“This Wild Strange Place: Local Narratives of Literacy Use in Appalachian Families Over Three Generations.”

“Challenging the Necessity of Organizational Community for Rhetorical Genre Use: Community and Genre in the Work of Integrated Marketing Communication Agency Writers.”

“A Qualitative Study That Investigates the Literacy Experiences of Immigrant English Language Learners in U.S. High Schools.”


“From Social Justice to Diversity: Tracing the Discourses of Affirmative Action.”

“Making Engagement: Education Reform Discourse and Organizational Change.”
Title indicates focus areas that provide a neutral forum for discussing and disseminating information on issues of vital public concern:

“Engaging Others in Online Social Networking Sites: Rhetorical Practices in MySpace and Facebook.”

“When East Meets West: Examining Classroom Discourse at the Albanian Socio-Political Intersection.”

“‘Disabling Discourses’: Disability Identity in Institutional Texts.”

These categories, or themes, are not mutually exclusive; titles could fall within more than one category. However, the categories indicate differences in the focus areas, research design, or goals of the dissertation. More importantly, these dissertation titles represent four key aspects of civic engagement. They are place-related, interactive, mutually beneficial, and integrated. According to the AASCU, “state colleges and universities are inextricably linked with the communities and regions in which they are located” (9). The dissertation titles I chose to highlight above from the 18 institutions demonstrated this “stewardship of place” because each seems contextualized to the institution’s neighbor. Next, each of the titles demonstrates interactivity, which “speaks to the intertwining or meshing of identities” that takes place between the rhetoric and composition program and community (9). The titles indicate an engagement that “refers to a spirit of give and take by the [researcher] and its partner” (9). Also, the dissertations represent mutual beneficience because they point to an engagement that “inure[s] to the benefit of both parties” (9). In this case, both the doctoral student in rhetoric and composition and the community agency benefited through the research process. The learning and discovery functions of the dissertation process were expanded while the community’s capacity to address and resolve
issues they confront were enhanced (9). These dissertation titles indicate engagement initiatives that can “build greater public understanding of and support for the role of the [field of rhetoric and composition] as a knowledge asset and resource” (9). Finally, the titles generally point to integration. By integration, I mean that engagement initiatives have permeated the department, and, because of this, have brought about opportunities for graduate students to research public concerns or issues from a rhetorical stance.

Statements about Program Strengths

At the end of the Rhetoric Review survey, programs were asked to describe and discuss their program’s strengths and weaknesses. Although 27 programs clearly demonstrated existence of civic engagement, only three identified this as a program strength. In other words, only 11% thought engagement activities or endeavors were a strong component in their respective programs. This is curious because thirteen programs clearly identified civic engagement concerns in their program description/mission statement. If issues of engagement are emphasized in the mission statement, it would seem a central concern and, thereby, a strength of the program. However, only three programs reported such a strength. The University of Arizona explicitly stated that “Service learning” and “Community connections” are strengths of the program. Similarly, Iowa State University identified “Excellent graduate student opportunities for teaching, research, and outreach” as their program strength. Although general and brief, it is quite clear the Iowa State rhetoric and composition doctoral program is preparing graduate students to link rhetoric to social issues. Finally, Virginia Tech described its strengths this way: “The program integrates the scholarship and teaching of our Rhetoric, Composition Studies, and Professional Writing faculty through a common focus on language in thinking,
knowing, negotiating, decision-making, and acting; We seek students interested in examining rhetoric and writing in public, academic, and corporate settings.”

The implications for the data collected in this category are unclear. Perhaps the programs valued other program components over civic engagement. Perhaps they viewed this area as a place to provide additional information regarding the program that did not fit into other sections of the survey. A final conclusion revolves around the debate over the institutionalization/implementation of civic engagement preparation. Perhaps with these programs, it is a debate framed as to whether the effort should have marginal or mainstream status (Ehrlich “Forward”). Although a high percentage of the programs did have faculty whose research and pedagogy focused on civic engagement issues, public engagement in general is “not an integral part of the curriculum for a majority” of programs (AASCU). In a survey conducted by AASCU, “Fewer than one-quarter [of institutions] require students to complete an internship, cooperative experience, community service, or service learning activity as part of their academic program” (14). However, it is unrealistic to expect faculty to require students to do any kind of civic engagement preparation when public engagement typically plays a minor role in faculty’s working lives. According to AASCU,

- only two out of five institutions include public engagement in faculty hiring criteria;
- when faculty are involved in public engagement, it is done over and beyond their regular assignment; and while most institutions indicate that they evaluate faculty on public engagement, few provide professional development for faculty in engagement-related areas. (14)

Although the AASCU survey was looking broadly at institutions in higher education, I would assert that these trends also apply to rhetoric and composition doctoral programs. So, it wouldn’t
be realistic to expect rhetoric and composition programs to identify civic engagement as a strength when neither the university nor the college or program values such preparation in its faculty and its student body.

I end this discussion of information from the *Rhetoric Review* survey with a quote from Andrea Lunsford:

> Can we rethink the Ph.D. in ways that will make our programs more open and inclusive, more truly diverse, more responsive to the dreams and desires of our students, more connected to emerging definitions of reading and writing, more collaborative, more engaged with issues close to the hearts of our communities? *Of course we can.* (*Writing Matters* 71)

Although the *Rhetoric Review* survey revealed some implicit moves by programs to prepare students for future faculty careers that contribute to the public good, I think, as Lunsford argues, we must continue to rethink the Ph.D. program so that it is more connected and engaged. The data collected in the 2007 *Rhetoric Review* survey has established a burgeoning trend in the field. There is more that is and can be done, and I will explore this in greater detail in the next section where I discuss data collected from my *Writing Program Administrator* questionnaire.

**Pilot Study Rhetoric and Writing Program Administrator Questionnaire**

The second mode of the study involved my questionnaire. In order to select participants, I referred to the contact people of 70 rhetoric and composition doctoral programs in the United States as listed in the website of the Doctoral Consortium in Rhetoric and Composition. Data
were collected over a five-week period between April 20\textsuperscript{th} and May 29\textsuperscript{th} in spring 2009. Of the 70 directors contacted, upon collection of the responses, I found I’d received 16 responses (See Appendix B). Although the data sample is small, I believe this project can still offer representative discussion of and recommendations for the field as a whole. Finally, although the conclusions I will advance are based on a very limited amount of data, I believe the discussion can still offer representative and beneficial analysis and recommendations.

In order to analyze the data collected, I used the first four categories (except the statements about program strengths category) used for the \textit{Rhetoric Review} survey (Table 3). Table 4, below, represents these categories, as well as additional specific categories identified from responses to my questionnaire. Those additional categories where I identified civic engagement awareness, focus, or preparation in the directors’ responses are “Explicit Program Definition of Civic Engagement,” “Prelim Exam Reading List,” “Outside Programs,” and “Other Examples.” From the questionnaire responses in general, I was able to determine whether a program required or encouraged civic engagement in the curriculum, dissertation focus area, program description/mission/goals and faculty research/pedagogy areas. This is similar to my analysis of the \textit{Rhetoric Review} survey, and so the first four columns of Table 4 are nearly identical to Table 3. The first question of my questionnaire provided the information for the fifth column titled “explicit program definition of civic engagement.” Information obtained from the other questions helped to inform the last three categories of this table. By outside programs, I refer to those doctoral programs that mention community outreach programs with community agencies. This can also take the form of service learning initiatives. By other examples, I refer to engagement preparation activities that do not fit in any other category. For example, Director F’s program has an internship experience and Director J’s program has developed an entire
citizen scholar program that takes on many forms and shapes because students co-create their experiences and projects. Data collected for the categories shown in Table 4 will be discussed in greater detail below. I have used letters to refer to individual directors in order to maintain their anonymity, as specified in the questionnaire consent form sent to the writing program administrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Dissertation Title/Focus Area</th>
<th>Program Description/ Mission Statement/ Goals</th>
<th>Core Faculty Research/ Pedagogy Areas</th>
<th>Explicit Program Definition of Civic Engagement</th>
<th>Prelim Exam Reading Lists</th>
<th>Outside Programs</th>
<th>Other Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Implicit w/in Program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Implicit w/in Program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Implicit w/in Program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Implicit w/in the discipline</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Implicit w/in the discipline</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>No Single Definition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definitions of Civic Engagement

The first question of my questionnaire asked directors how he or she personally or his/her rhetoric and composition doctorate program define civic engagement. Of the 16 responses, 5 (31%) reported that their programs had developed an explicit definition of civic engagement.
Two directors reported that they believed civic engagement was implicit within the program or discipline, and 7 offered musings but no official program definition. Finally, one director reported that the program did not follow one single definition of civic engagement. Overall, the directors’ responses revealed that programs not only lack a fixed meaning or do not enforce strict parameters in conceptualizing or defining civic engagement, but there are a myriad of definitions from which to choose. For Eric Sheffield, “there simply are too many definitions,” and because of this, civic engagement is “over-defined” (46). “The practice of defining, and then defining, and then defining again (rather than a reasonable and evolving re-defining) has accomplished […] a bothersome aspect: by being everything for everyone, [civic engagement] is quickly becoming nothing” (47).

Although I do not agree with Sheffield that civic engagement is becoming nothing, I do find the lack of a unified theory, philosophy or vision of civic engagement problematic within rhetoric and composition. Without one valid definition of what constitutes civic engagement pedagogy, I think, generally, programs struggle to re-define (as Sheffield suggests) it, to develop curricula, to evaluate and reward faculty, and to encourage student scholarship. Even though there is a lack of unified vision in the directors’ responses, I have organized the responses according to the following themes that emerged in order to situate how directors are defining or conceptualizing civic engagement: For the most part, there was a “Lack of Fixed Meaning or Strict Parameters;” oftentimes, directors’ definitions revolved around the “Curricular Focus” of civic engagement; directors felt that the “Field is Naturally Engaged” and so no formal definition is needed; and, finally, directors typically discussed “Broad Concepts” in their definitions while few offered a “Concrete Civic Focus.”
Lack of Fixed Meaning or Strict Parameters:

As I discussed earlier, I found that most directors don’t, as Director I states, “deploy [civic engagement] as a term with a fixed meaning or strict parameters.” In fact most define civic engagement broadly and encourage civic activity, civic literacy, and/or civic research in student and faculty projects. However, some indicated that they do not “construe it to mean requiring students to perform civic benefit projects” because they were concerned this would seem too coercive (Director H). Although most directors indicated that there was no agreed upon definition in their rhetoric and composition graduate programs, some indicated that there is a shared understanding. Director L reported that civic engagement is understood as “collaboration between writing groups (or individuals) and local/public institutions that results in writing that serves a function for the community/public.” Director M offered a similar shared understanding: “Our graduate rhetoric and composition courses engage with a variety of theoretical and historical frameworks for understanding civic engagement as it relates to rhetoric, writing, literacy, and the teaching of writing.” By not advocating a single definition, Director M’s program encourages “students to explore the variety of ways in which writing, speaking, and teaching may be connected to public participation.”

Similar to Director M, Director B argued that civic engagement “includes activities that reach outside the university setting.” And it arises naturally “in relation to students’ projects and interests,” according to Director A. This is because civic engagement is an activity that is issue-related where it “aims to make the local community (and perhaps the world) a better place” (Director B). Because most of the definitions did not follow strict parameters, the directors and their programs were able to encourage civic engagement with greater freedom, which can foster
greater diversity. However, it is just as important to be clear on what civic engagement entails in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs because civic engagement is such a broad term.

Curricular Focus:

A curricular focus is another theme that emerged in directors’ definitions of civic engagement. This finding supports the Wingspread participants’ assertion that institutionalization of civic engagement entails the integration of engagement into teaching and learning (Brukardt et al). Director P’s response to the first question indicated that if the program did define civic engagement, s/he would want them “to think about it not only from the perspective of outreach or programs beyond the curriculum but also in curricular terms.” In fact, many of the directors seemed to indicate that they would define civic engagement as any instance when instructors and students “explore issues through reading, writing, and discussion” (Director P).

Building on this curricular focus within civic engagement, Director N indicated that s/he would define civic engagement for a rhetoric program that “emphasize[d] service learning and rhetorical instruction that stresses the development of students’ citizenship.” This is consistent with the *Rhetoric Review* data where program mission statements clearly emphasized one of its goals as the formation of citizens. It was the University of North Carolina that emphasized citizenship, writing that “[i]n our view no skills are more crucial to our students’ development toward their role as citizens in our nation and world.” Embedding a political focus that promotes the good citizen within the curriculum also connects the data from my questionnaire with epideictic discourse theories, both classical and contemporary (Sheard).

Curricular concerns within civic engagement definitions were also connected to graduate students’ teaching experiences. Director M emphasized the importance of graduate students
teaching first year composition programs and developing their own curriculum. Oftentimes, first year composition programs are the primary teaching venue for rhetoric and composition graduate students. Because of this, Director M’s program

integrate[s] two notions of civic engagement into the curriculum: (1) Our English 102 course is grounded in classical rhetoric's understanding of rhetorical training as preparation for civic participation; this course is organized around an Aristotelian definition of rhetoric, supplemented with Toulmin argumentation, to teach students to discover and construct persuasive arguments about contemporary political and social issues; (2) Special sections of both ENGL 101 and 102 include a service learning component, which we define as out-of-class service to community agencies that applies or responds to academic material and skills central to the course's goals.

The two notions Director M discusses offer insight into how a curricular emphasis in civic engagement might impact its incorporation within doctoral programs. Rhetoric’s classical concern with rhetorical training as preparation for civic participation is reaffirmed when specific behaviors, such as the application of academic material and skills to contemporary political and social issues, are urged in the curriculum. This recurrent theme, then, offers a site where programs may reevaluate and revise how epideictic discourse is taught in doctoral programs so that they might also incorporate engagement preparation. As the data collected suggests, this preparation may take place in the doctoral coursework or as part of the graduate student’s teaching experience in first year composition.

*Rhetoric and Composition is Inherently Engaged:*

Another theme that emerged in how programs are defining civic engagement is the belief that the field is naturally engaged. Perhaps this is because, as Thomas Miller argues, “rhetoric
has [historically] been defined as the art of celebrating public values, resolving legal conflicts, and deliberating over political policies and actions" (7). Directors may see no need to espouse a formal definition because rhetoric has historically defined itself in the engaged “domain between the popular experience and the educated culture” (Miller 6). This belief is evident in responses such as Director C’s who writes that “it would be hard to conceive of any work that we do in the program that does not involve civic engagement. Teaching, learning, writing and reading all involve engagement with society.” Engaged activities within rhetoric, then, entail “involvements beyond the campus, whether they are instructional, collaborative, or service oriented” (Director C). Director D furthered this definition, stating that engaged activities in a naturally engaged field “bring community artifacts/knowledge/resources into the classroom.” Whether programs believe that the field is naturally engaged or not, it is noteworthy to point out that directors identify a principle element when defining civic engagement: Reciprocity. Director F defines civic engagement as “any reciprocal literacy activity between faculty/student and the community.” Graduate students must engage or interact with the community when a course espouses engaged practices, and whether the artifact is a service experience the student has at the community site or a tangible object, that student will gain knowledge and this will then be evident when s/he pursues similar scholarship in future work.

**Broad Concepts:**

Another theme that emerged in the definitions directors provided centered on the broad conceptions upon which programs base their engaged practices. For example, Director G offered various manifestations of civic engagement, which include “scholarship of engagement (which is highlighted in promotion/tenure documents across our whole university), and writing
about public issues and problems.” This definition highlights not only various manifestations, it also brings to light the importance of institutional support in legitimizing and supporting faculty scholarship of engagement. By legitimizing engaged faculty scholarship and work, institutions also add meaning by valuing the measurable content of faculty public service roles. Additional aspects of Director G’s definition of civic engagement are striking because they also emphasize the importance of faculty commitments to engagement in their respective professional lives. As discussed earlier, both Furco and the Wingspread participants emphasize the importance of renewing and redefining discovery and scholarship, and I would add that this is especially essential in rhetoric and composition programs for both faculty and students. Director G offered specific examples of the program’s attempts to redefine student scholarship. Official manifestations consisted of the “readings suggested in the “Composition Studies and Engagement” section of [the] prelim list and [the] recent revision of Program Goals to mention service learning as an option for students.” Director G also then provided a few examples of how faculty members had redefined their scholarship by incorporating engagement in their professional lives. Examples ranged from computer-based programs and advising student dissertations on broad topics to scholarship of engagement. Transforming civic engagement through technology in rhetoric and composition ties important areas of research and teaching in doctoral student preparation. Director G reported that

One faculty member has been involved for years in such computer-oriented activities as programs in an area retirement community, a computer camp for sixth grade girls, and online efforts at faculty development with other institutions and our campus.

Three specific important areas of rhetoric and composition doctoral student preparation involve literacy, computer-mediated communication, and community service. The technology aspect of
Director G’s definition is useful in impacting how programs incorporate civic engagement because the Internet and other digital technologies will continue to emerge and serve as vehicles for enhancing civic involvement in rhetoric and composition.

As mentioned earlier, examples of engaged faculty work involving students typically consisted of advising on dissertation research at Director G’s program:

One person has worked with students on dissertations involving such broadly engaged topics as writing as therapy for the seriously ill, dual high-school/college writing instruction, and post-9/11 trauma rhetoric and pedagogy.

[Another] person has had scholarship of engagement as a key research interest for several years and he has moved information from this research into graduate seminars […]. This person also has advised a dissertation on scholarship of engagement and encouraged student interest in service learning as a professional direction and dissertation topic.

Civic engagement, then, at Director G’s program provides a more substantial linkage between rhetorical theory and practice than might otherwise be achieved because students are prepared by experienced faculty for professional lives informed by discovery and application of knowledge. As directors continue to develop explicit definitions of civic engagement for their respective programs, they will find that this will also provide additional means of showing the value of preparing engaged composition scholars. Embracing civic engagement gives substance to the rhetoric of engagement, partnerships, and social issues. It also creates new and potentially prolific interdisciplinary linkages, “with the cross-fertilization of ideas [and] fresh perspectives” (AASCU 12). This is apparent in the final example Director G offered

One person is now exploring ways to connect undergraduate language arts students with teachers in the community. This person also encourages students interested in service
learning (and other civic engagement) to do projects on those topics in courses in Writing Assessment and in Research Methods.

**Concrete Civic Focus:**

The final theme that emerged in the definitions program directors reported consisted of a very concrete civic focus in their conceptualization of civic engagement. Director J explained that his/her Rhetoric and Writing program “focuses on rhetoric in society.” Andrea Lunsford observed in 1992 that rhetoric remained cautiously vigilant of its “effects in the world beyond as well as in the academy” (“Rhetoric” 76). This propensity helps to keep the curriculum more current and responsive. Director J asserts that his/her program remains current by studying the “language use and rhetorical activity in public, academic, corporate, and governmental settings, in a collective effort to engage pressing social and cultural issues from the perspective of rhetorical and writing studies.” Director J’s program is situated in a land-grant university, and so there is a legacy of seeking students who want to

engage in research into how rhetoric and writing can contribute to social progress, how literate practices create, circulate and prioritize societal values and the public policies based on those values, and how rhetoric and writing empower and control access to power in these social systems.

Collectively, the research agenda at Director J’s program attempts to address “rhetorical and social problems” in a number of broadly engaged topics. These include “science and technology,” “diversity and difference,” “the environment,” “scholarly inquiry,” “medicine and disability,” “education,” “civic engagement,” and “globalized communication and commerce.”

These broad topics embedded within program definitions of civic engagement support the themes from data findings in the dissertation titles of the *Rhetoric Review* survey. As with the
dissertation titles, civic engagement definitions also seem to infer applied research that is designed by doctoral students to help increase the understanding of a social problem and/or test solutions for that problem, and this is just another important factor impacting how civic engagement might be implemented in a doctoral program in rhetoric and composition. Implementation is also dependent upon the mission of the institution and program, the community in which the university is situated, the learning outcomes of the program, and the assessment and rewards system of faculty. There are countless other criteria impacting how a rhetoric and writing program could define and implement civic engagement in graduate student preparation.

To sum up, doctoral programs in rhetoric and composition seem to be defining civic engagement based on curricular concerns that also include both broad engaged topics and a concrete civic focus. Definitions involve a certain level of reciprocity based on the inherently engaged nature of the field. While most programs did not espouse an explicit definition with strict parameters, directors reported a generally held understanding among faculty that civic engagement connects teaching, learning, and research to public participation. Robert Bringle, director of the Center for Service and Learning at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis, emphasizes this partnership in his definition of civic engagement: “Civic engagement is active collaboration that builds on the resources, skills, expertise, and knowledge of the campus and community to improve the quality of life in communities in a manner that is consistent with the campus mission.” I would argue that civic engagement must also be consistent with the program mission because it is important to link learning outcomes with what civic engagement entails. While the breadth of civic engagement “fosters great diversity of activity, it also presents the risk that the term can say everything and nothing at the same time”
(AASCU 8). The lack of a clear definition could leave some rhetoric and composition doctoral programs with the impression that they are preparing students to do engagement, when in fact they are not.

Encouraging and/or Requiring Participation in Civic Engagement

The second question I posed to directors inquired whether their program required or encouraged doctoral students to participate in civic engagement. Directors were also encouraged to provide brief details. The feedback from directors for this question seemed to fall within the following categories: Encouraged, Course Requirement/Component, Program Requirement, and Neither Encouraged nor Required. Nine of the 16 directors (or 56%) reported that their programs encouraged civic engagement. Two directors (12%) reported civic engagement emerging as a course requirement/component. Two directors (12%) also reported that their programs require civic engagement. Finally, three directors (nearly 19%) responded that their programs neither require civic engagement nor do they encourage students to participate in civic engagement. Below, Table 5 shows the program responses. The findings and detailed discussion of responses for this question are discussed in greater detail later.

Table 5. Programs Reporting Civic Engagement Required, Encouraged or Promoted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Director</th>
<th>CE Required</th>
<th>CE Encouraged</th>
<th>Courses Promote CE Awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Not explicitly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Informally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Not explicitly/ Sporadic</td>
<td>Occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Encouraged:**

Because most of the directors’ responses indicated that they encourage civic engagement, some clear themes seemed to emerge. Programs encouraged engagement generally, based on student interest, through dissertation and course research, and through teaching and other campus programs, such as a Writing Center. Encouraging student engagement in this way not only legitimizes and supports student engaged scholarship but also energizes student work – to provide them a vehicle for raising new questions and topics for research and teaching.

**General encouragement:**

While most of the responses provided explicit details, respondents in this category only gave brief details. In general, programs are encouraging civic engagement, as Director B reported. This seems to be caused, in part, to a “community ethos”. Director K acknowledged that, while there was no official requirement, “graduate students become an important part of that ethos.” Whether they come for that reason or not, students usually “embrace it by the time they leave.”

**Encouragement based on student interest:**

Most programs encouraged civic engagement based on student interest. One way that programs accomplish this is by “being responsive to students’ interests” (Director A). Student interest is impacted by the student’s past knowledge. Director A elaborated on this point: “A number of students do come with awareness of the social power of writing and some come with
overt political interests. Others come with interests in public sphere processes. Others have interests in writing in socially responsive professions.” By capitalizing on those interests, programs encourage student engagement. For example, Director G’s program encourages students to develop those interests by “taking courses offered by the Education College, [and] workshops led by the university’s Service Learning program.”

The rationale for encouraging civic engagement, rather than requiring it, is, in part, due to directors’ leeryness to “over-require […] students to do much” (Director I). Rather, programs encourage students to “define a path for their scholarly careers and pursue them with diligence, tenacity, and honesty” (Director I). In addition to concerns of overloading doctoral students, Director N thinks that “students’ teaching and study demands probably discourage civic engagement.” As discussed in Chapter Two, the Carnegie Initiative on the Doctorate (CID) found that “doctoral students […] often feel burdened” by numerous competing demands (5). However, the merits of encouraging and supporting civic engagement interests on an individual basis can be argued. At least, one can hope that the student receives attention and guidance that is tailored to their needs. On the other hand, the encouragement may be infrequent, as Director N reported. S/he did share that “a professor with an interest in queer studies draw[s] some students into his community work on AIDS awareness,” but that is sporadic.

Encouragement through dissertation and course research:

Programs also encourage civic engagement through dissertation and course research. Although Director G mentioned that the program encourages civic engagement based on student interest, he also discussed that the program further helps the students develop the interests by
doing projects in appropriate courses, doing dissertations relating to civic engagement--
and to other, broader aspects of “engagement.” My reference to dissertations, there,
prompts me to add a note.

In the first question, Director G had also pointed out that a number of dissertations had been
encouraged that also focused on broadly “engaged” topics – from scholarship of engagement to
service learning and assessment.

Explicitly engaged dissertation work has been completed or begun. Several years ago,
a student began a dissertation (completed in 2008-2009) with the title “Rhetoric and the
Scholarship of Engagement: Pragmatic, Professional, and Ethical Convergences.” In
2008-2009 a student began work on a dissertation titled “Preparing Doctoral Students in
Rhetoric and Composition for Faculty Careers that Contribute to the Public Good.” And
a first-year-student currently is doing a service learning related project in the Writing
Assessment course thinking about doing a dissertation dealing with service learning.

Similarly, Director L outlined dissertation research involving civic engagement that his/her
program encouraged: “I also encourage dissertation projects that include civic engagement.

Currently, two students are working to develop GED materials for the local reading/community
literacy center (in collaboration with the teachers and students there) that will be housed online
and will give the center greater reach (and support of the community).” Civic engagement
encouragement through course research and dissertation projects is beneficial because it provides
an environment where students might document engagement as academic work, rather than
private interests. This democratizes knowledge production in rhetoric while acknowledging
different ways of knowing and writing, as well as different types of knowledge and literacy
practices.
Encouragement through teaching and other campus programs:

Another theme that emerged in responses is that programs encourage civic engagement by supporting it in the doctoral students’ teaching or through other campus programs. For example, Director C affirmed that “TAs in our program can design and teach service learning courses.” Similarly, Director E’s program requires students to teach first year composition which is all about civic engagement through rhetoric. Students study discourses involving civic deliberation and engage in civic discussions themselves. The whole course is about public discourse. Our tech writing courses (which many doctoral students teach) involves service learning.

Director M’s first year composition course (mentioned in question 1) also has a required civic engagement component and is taught primarily by the rhetoric/composition graduate students: we integrate two notions of civic engagement into the curriculum: (1) […] grounded in classical rhetoric’s understanding of rhetorical training as preparation for civic participation […] to teach students to discover and construct persuasive arguments about contemporary political and social issues; (2) include a service learning component, which we define as out-of-class service to community agencies that applies or responds to academic material and skills central to the course's goals.”

Other programs that require the graduate students to teach the undergraduate composition course, such as Director I’s, “DO encourage our graduate-student faculty to teach courses with a civic component, service learning portion, or something related to public discourse” although this is not a requirement as with Director M.

Students are also encouraged to do civic engagement through other campus programs, such as the writing center. Students who are teaching assistants in Director C’s Writing Center,
for instance, “can volunteer to be assigned to the community satellite writing center.” In
addition to this, Director C’s “Center for the Humanities also has a program in which graduate
students can propose and be funded for some sort of collaboration with a community
organization or school that brings together teaching/learning and the grad student's research
interest. These grants are competitive.” The program in the Center for the Humanities calls to
mind Andrea Lunsford’s assertion that faculty “might be wisest to let […] students lead us: they
are the ones who are conceiving […] projects, and they have solid and imaginative ways of
going about this work. We have much to learn from listening to them” (Writing Matters 69).

Civic engagement encouraged through campus programs provides students the opportunity to be
colleagues rather than acolytes, as Lunsford insists.

Outreach programs are another venue where students can be encouraged to do civic
engagement. Such off-campus programs are beneficial because it positions and presents rhetoric
and composition as a positive, contributing member, not only of the community but also in the
university. These experiences then become the vehicle for students exercising civic
responsibility in faculty careers while also preparing them for a career informed by rhetorical
theory and participatory citizenship. Director M’s program clearly does both:

Our English department houses several outreach programs (poetry in the schools, writing
center) that create opportunities for graduate students to work in the community. The
English graduate student group typically lobbies on behalf of graduate-student interests
and needs; they also do a fund-raiser for a local charity and a service project most years.
Graduate students are generally encouraged to participate in one or more of these efforts.
Course Requirement/Component:

For the most part, directors reported that civic engagement was either a requirement in an elective course or an optional component in a required course. Only one director (Director F) reported that his/her program included a required course that also required civic engagement. Director F stated that one required course consisted of a “professional or community internship.” However, s/he did not elaborate on the details. In most cases, the civic engagement component was sporadic, as Director C affirmed: “Occasionally I will teach a course that includes service learning or a course that has an option for volunteering in the community for credit.” Again, civic engagement is often not required but an encouraged component. Director H commented that his/her Ph.D. program “encourages doctoral students to participate in civic engagement but does not require it specifically in the materials.” For Director L, his/her program does require civic engagement work, “but none of those classes is required of all Ph.D. students.” Despite this, Directors H and L described these courses in detail. A few themes seem to emerge from those descriptions: courses that require civic engagement or that have a civic engagement component often exist because of informal mentoring from the professor who is teaching the course. Likewise, the civic engagement takes place as a student-designed off-campus project that is inspired by course content or it takes place as community outreach collaboration which has been developed by and between the professor of the course and a community agency.

For example, in Director H’s program, two of the four core courses contain civic engagement components that have resulted in student projects that took students outside the university structure. It is the English 547 class and it is titled “History of Rhetoric (Greeks through Renaissance).” They spend
four weeks on Isocrates, Cicero, Quintilian, and the classical conception of civic virtue. Course projects that have come out of this tradition include high school projects to increase student participation in extra-curricular activities, first-year composition units involving attendance at city council meetings, guidelines for local business in diversity policies, and proposals to enhance equity for graduate students.

What is striking about this example is the interconnectedness of faculty and student intellectual work as it is made more visible to, current for, and valued by the public. Bruce Horner, in his article “Traditions and Professionalization: Reconceiving Work in Composition,” argues that composition faculty must redefine both their scholarly pursuits and teaching pedagogies.

Rather than defining themselves as academic entrepreneurs pursuing private interests or engaging in purportedly ‘disinterested’ scholarship, Composition faculty who understand writing classrooms as working at the point of production of society could align with public constituencies in redefining and pursing the public good in their work with students […]. (394)

Horner’s argument hinges on composition resisting professionalization because it does not commodify scholarship through language and requirements that rely on “reductively utilitarian definitions of those goods in terms of ‘growth’ and the production of exchange value” (394). Although Horner is focusing on faculty professionalism and scholarship, his argument speaks to the kind of review taking place in Director H’s program. Faculty have reconceptualized their teaching pedagogy, which has then resulted in an engaged learning space where graduate students might foster a rhetoric of engagement and partnership through course projects and outreach. Engagement supports linkages and exchange of intellectual ideas between faculty and
graduate students, between those students and the community, and then within the resulting scholarship of both faculty and student.

Director H also offered another example that illustrates the interactive, mutually beneficial, and integrated aspects of civic engagement components within required courses. One professor who is responsible for the required methods course, informally mentors students in their qualitative and ethnographic research for their dissertations and has helped establish software resources for graduate students for the analysis of interviews and qualitative data. Having been a rhetorician working at [a] National Lab, he knows the importance of working with and within communities to facilitate, study, and perform valuable work. He works with [students] at [our program] to think about the active roles they can take in communities that are important to them.

Director L provided an example where the professor of the class worked with specific community agencies and then made the civic engagement work required in his class.

For example, in the practicum for new teachers of Professional Writing, students are required to do a civic engagement project in order to learn how to run one in their classes. The last time I taught the course we developed educational materials to support Adventure Cycling's Underground Railroad Historical Bicycle Trail. Another example comes from the Archives class. There the students describe collections for the local historical society and then mount an exhibit for the community of materials related to the collections they described. Another example comes from the qualitative research class in which we have students collect oral histories at the state veteran's home.
These directors’ anecdotes offer invaluable examples as to how the field might rethink doctoral education in rhetoric and composition.

Program Required:

Whereas previous examples have focused on informal and required preparation in course work, this discussion will focus on programs whose directors reported that their programs required some form of civic engagement activity. These required activities typically consisted of specific, special programs designed for doctoral students in a particular rhetoric and composition program. An example of this is the Transformative Graduate Education (TGE) program at Director J’s doctoral program. Director J provided exhaustive detail of the required TGE program. This initiative was created to “expand and modernize the graduate experience” so that graduates become citizen scholars. The rationale for this program can best be described as participatory action research where students learn because they are involved. It is comprised of three main interconnecting elements: the Preparing the Future Professoriate/Professional (PFP2) program, the Graduate Education Development Institute (GEDI), and Citizen Scholar Engagement (CSE). Together, these three components enhance the preparation of and better equip […] graduate students with knowledge and the skills needed for meaningful and relevant contributions to the 21st century.

The Citizen-Scholar Engagement (CSE) experience is a program designed to give graduate students an opportunity to utilize their academic skills and knowledge in a real-world setting. It is hoped students who participate in the experience will gain "public scholarship" - scholarship in service to the community, the state, the nation, and the world.
CSE offers a myriad of ways for students to gain public scholarship experience, such as “community-based collaborative projects, leadership training opportunities, "global" seminars, and a variety of similar activities [that] prepare the student to serve in varying capacities.” One of the intended learning outcomes of this program is that participants will apply the scholarship gained in school and apply not only in their faculty careers but “as good citizens.”

Participants of the CSE program must complete an independent, self-designed experience. It can be “composed of multiple small components or one large component” where students complete at least 16 hours of “citizen scholar work.” Length and type of the individual experiences are determined by the student participants. Examples of previous experiences include service projects, Citizen Scholar internships, Citizen Scholar seminars, and other experiences as designed by the student participant. The service project is a self-designed, community-based project aimed at helping the student put theory to practice. Students choose a project that will be challenging and educational. Projects will vary greatly in their scope and time-commitment from one student to another. The Citizen Scholar internship is coordinated by the Graduate School. It essentially is a collaboration with another state agency to offer Citizen Scholar Internships.

Citizen Scholar Interns work closely with [the state agency] developing and carrying out need-based projects for the State […]. Projects can be developed for ALL academic departments within the university.

Finally, the Citizen Scholar seminar is a three-credit hour seminar taught by the Graduate School. “The course addresses topics relating to public scholarship, leadership, citizenship, and ethics.” This example provided by Director J clearly indicates that his/her doctoral program in
rhetoric and composition has clearly embraced civic engagement as a core value and defining characteristic by deeply embedding that core value in their doctoral student preparation.

*Neither Encouraged nor Required:*

Finally, three of the 16 programs (nearly 19%) responded that they neither encouraged nor required civic engagement in their programs. A lack of program encouragement or requirements doesn’t necessarily suggest engagement is discouraged. But the lack of encouragement is not surprising because civic engagement is still relatively new in higher education. This statistic is also congruent with the findings from the AASCU survey mentioned earlier in this chapter. They found that “fewer than one-quarter [of institutions] require students to complete an internship, cooperative experience, community service, or service learning activity as part of their academic program” (14). However, this is just one challenge of public engagement and it is based on a myriad of factors, including lack of funding, lack of faculty and student interest, and unwillingness to abandon or revision historical, if not antiquated, traditions. Some of these factors will be discussed in later sections of this chapter, as well as Chapter Five.

*Duration of Civic Engagement Requirement/Encouragement*

The third question of my questionnaire asked directors who answered “yes” in question 2 to report how long their programs have been requiring or encouraging civic engagement preparation of doctoral students. The specific responses will be explored in greater length later; however, Table 6 (below) provides the specific amount of time for each director. Interestingly enough, some programs reported more general responses. For example, Director A answered that they had been encouraging civic engagement “[a]s long as students express such interests,
we support exploration and projects.” It can be assumed that throughout this program’s history, they have supported or encouraged some form of civic engagement only if and when students expressed an interest.
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</table>

Directors who provided a specific amount of time also contextualized where and how the civic engagement had been encouraged or required. Several themes also emerged in the responses for this section. Directors reported encouraging or requiring civic engagement through graduate courses, special programs (such as internships), composition courses taught by graduate students, and, finally, through example set by faculty. These themes are consistent with the themes that emerged in question two. Director D indicated that this question was not applicable to his/her program, and Directors N, O and P left no response. This is not surprising as all three indicated that civic engagement was neither required nor encouraged or explicitly encouraged.
Graduate Courses:

Directors B, C, J and K all indicated that their programs had incorporated some sort of civic engagement at all levels of their graduate courses for a specific amount of time (see Table 6 above for the exact amount of times). Director G indicated that civic engagement efforts “are picking up momentum as more faculty feature civic and other engagement in graduate seminars and, especially, with changes (described later) in Prelim Exam reading list and our first Program Goal.” Similarly, Director H explained that, although civic engagement had been encouraged in the program since 1991, the civic engagement emphasis “became greater with the creation of our [university’s] Comm[unication] program, which places emphasis on new media.” Director H then went into greater detail about the example faculty set, and that emphasis inspired the faculty example category discussed later in this section. Director L explained that s/he had been doing community projects for 25 years or more within both graduate and undergraduate professional writing classes. “I was told I was hired because I believed in serving the community, and so I expect the tradition is long indeed.”

Graduate Student Taught Composition:

Directors also reported that civic engagement was encouraged or emphasized through the teaching that graduate students did in composition courses. Director C indicated that “TAs have been offering service learning courses for 5 or 6 years.” Similarly, Director E reported that his/her program has “always emphasized public discourse in the teaching that our doctoral students do,” and that program is 3 decades old. Director I reported that his/her program had been encouraging civic engagement through the composition curriculum for more than 6 to 8 years. Although we do not know how it is encouraged in the curriculum, it is as least present.
Finally, Director M detailed that the “The rhetorical/civic issues curriculum for ENGL 102 has been in place for about ten years.” The specifics of this curriculum were discussed in detail in an earlier discussion of questionnaire responses to question 2.

*Special Programs:*

Directors also reported the duration their special programs had been encouraging civic engagement. The internship that Director F, mentioned in earlier discussions of questionnaire responses, has been part of their curriculum since the beginning of the program. Also, in addition to the graduate courses mentioned, Directors C and K also highlight the amount of time specific special programs had been in existence. Director C reported that the Humanities Center grants program had been in existence for 3 years and the Writing Center satellite for 5 years. Director K reported that the program had “quite recently made the move to recommend more community-building and engagement in a range of partnerships across campus -- within the past 2 years.” Similarly, Director M outlined his/her program’s community programs: “the poetry in the schools, service learning sections of first-year comp, and writing center outreach have been in place for 8-10 years. I started or co-started all of these initiatives, which grow from my research interests; however, over time they have been integrated into the department’s general activities.” This leads to the next section: faculty example. Over time, programs seemed to have espoused civic engagement as an outgrowth from faculty research interests.

*Example Set by Faculty:*

As mentioned earlier, Directors L and M discussed that their programs began to encourage or incorporate civic engagement because of their personal research interests.
However, Director H provided explicit details about the progression that took place which led to his/her program incorporating civic engagement. The program emphasizes new media, and Director H states that “Much of [civic engagement activity] comes from the example set by the faculty. For instance, the head of our Studio for New Media is very much engaged in pro bono civic improvement projects.” As webmaster for a historic preservation commission project, he “[h]elped to design a system for [the] city agency which researches the history of local architecture and protects historically significant buildings.” He also served as webmaster for the “Telling the Stories of [a] County project.” He designed the website and flew down to the local university to “train students and faculty on oral history interviewing/recording best practices, for the development of an oral history website capturing the stories from a difficult time in the Civil Rights movement” in a rural portion of the state. A final example Director H mentioned for this particular faculty member involved his pro bono work as a web developer for the Good Neighbor Emergency Assistance program. With this particular project, he helped to develop a “content management system for a nonprofit organization that coordinates assistance and relief for residents [in the local community] living in or near the poverty level, to help them find and/or keep their housing.”

The example set by faculty is noteworthy to mention because it then led to Ph.D. students completing pro bono technology work with groups in the surrounding community:

A few years ago, a team of […] students worked with the Olive Tree Project, a collaborative effort between [the university’s] public policy and administration program and small cities in [neighboring] Counties. The project explored how small communities can share local services while retaining their independent
identities. The team […] created a visual identity, designed documents, and built a website for the project. The project has been completed and the website is no longer online, but you can find some of the artifacts they created.

One of the male students mentioned in the team for the Olive Tree Project also hosts and maintains the website for the central state’s National Alliance on Mental Illness. The website was created by a student for her MA creative component in the program, and he volunteered to keep the site going when she graduated.

Indeed, the data that question three generated supports Marback’s claim that in current rhetoric and composition doctoral programs graduate students […] implicitly learn a stance toward the world through their acquisition of theoretical knowledge. But this is not the same as teaching students to use theoretical knowledge to take a stance toward the world and toward the people who inhabit it […] [or] preparing students to take stances supported by theoretical knowledge and encouraged by the ethics of the profession. (821-22)

The data acquired in the question three responses demonstrates that programs can, indeed, and are providing graduate students with the opportunities to use theoretical knowledge to take a stance on public issues. The learning experiences of these graduate students, as reported by the directors in my study, further exhibit how we can convey complex intellectual relations and projects of the field while emphasizing our obligation to be responsive to the world (Royster). In other words, by encouraging or requiring forms of civic engagement preparation, programs are teaching graduate students to use what they have “come to know to make [the] world a better place” (Royster 1227).
Fostering Student Awareness while Preparing them to Incorporate Civic Engagement Practices in Future Faculty Careers

The central question of this study explored whether and how rhetoric and composition doctoral programs make students aware of civic engagement and prepare them to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers. In question four, directors were asked to provide details as to how they prepare their doctoral students for civic engagement in their careers. A number of themes emerged in the responses. Although some of these themes are similar to those discussed in question two, the themes here are based on elaborated or additional, new details in the directors’ responses to question four. First, programs prepare students informally and explicitly through course offerings. For example, programs may make students aware of civic engagement in required or elective courses. As discussed earlier in question two, this would be considered informal because the civic engagement component is not required but emerges in the course. Director P’s response demonstrated this aspect. His/her program “requires two courses: “History of Criticism” and “Seminar in Pedagogy.” Depending on the teacher, the latter may make students aware of civic engagement. And there are some faculty members who stress civic engagement in elective courses they offer” (emphasis added). Another example of informal preparation emerges in Director C’s response: “Some of us cover service learning research in our course readings” (emphasis added). I would consider this informal because although the class is required (an introduction to composition studies), not all of the instructors cover service learning research.

Informal preparation also transpires through other activities in the department. Director C reported that this preparation “is informal through staff development [and] reading circles.” Finally, informal civic engagement preparation emerges in programs “[o]nly by virtue of [the
graduate students’] experiences as teachers of first-year writing” (Director E). On the other hand, explicit preparation takes place in programs when they unequivocally plan and link civic engagement in a course, whether required or not. For example, Director A reported that “We have a course in the history of writing and the organization of society that makes such connections explicit. Also the course in lifelong development of writing looks at adult uses of writing in the community.”

Therefore, coursework/course curriculum seems to be the primary mode for both informal and explicit connections. However, other forms of awareness and preparation are emerging through program changes, student projects, electronic environments, and faculty projects. Although only one director, Director O, responded that his/her program neither makes students aware nor does it prepare them to incorporate civic engagement, two programs did touch on the fact that they believed the field to be inherently engaged. These responses are also explored at the end of the discussion for question four.

Coursework/ Course Curriculum:

The curriculum of courses and seminars in rhetoric and composition offer an ideal environment for programs to link civic engagement with the learning objectives and required projects. For courses with explicit connections, it is especially helpful to see how students are made aware of civic engagement. Director J provided useful details regarding a specific course in his/her doctoral program titled “Rhetoric in Society.” The course focuses on the “[s]tudy of the relationship of language and human action, with emphasis on how rhetoric reflects and shapes social practices and how literate activity operates in a complex society; emphasis on written communication.” This course is especially beneficial in making students aware of civic
engagement because they learn to “define and explain the social and political functions of rhetoric in classical and contemporary contexts” according to Director J. One way that students accomplish this learning objective is by exploring and elucidating the “public sphere” and the roles rhetoric plays in it. Students also explore the role of argumentation in “professional discursive practices, especially in written discourse.” There are also a number of ways that this course prepares students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers, and one such way emerges in the course objectives. One objective of the course is to “[d]efine research questions that explore uses of rhetoric in formulating public opinion.” Faculty that wish to contribute to the public good will need to be able to analyze, especially in writing, the role of rhetoric in “creating meaning in the social contexts in which professional and public discourse occur” (Director J). Because of this, courses such as this one offer fruitful linkages between student work within this course and professional work in their faculty careers.

The syllabus for this course is divided into seven sections based on various civic engagement themes. The course explores the principles of rhetorical analysis and of argumentation; Habermas, the public sphere and communicative action; rhetoric and inquiry; democracy and rhetoric; civic engagement in the classical period; and civic engagement in the contemporary period. Director J offered detailed justification for the themes explored in this course:

A democratic society, its values, and its policies are shaped by the literate practices that generate, circulate, and apply knowledge. Rhetoric enables citizens to negotiate issues of policy and define the values of the society in which they live. Its power lies in the realm of uncertain knowledge. […] Through systematic means of inquiry, rhetoric enables citizens and their representatives to answer questions such as these: What are the
priorities? Who has access to power? Who are the stakeholders? What might be the long-term consequences? What constraints limit our ability to develop new ideas? These questions and their answers depend on and develop the values of the society.

Adding to Director J’s response, I would also argue that the development and preparation of students for the public good depends on the exploration of these questions and their answers in seminars such as this one. This exploration develops the values they will apply in their future faculty careers and in the community.

Society is best served by people who are experts at asking questions that have short- and long-term effects on decisions. Such experts must think strategically in answering the questions Director J posed above. This involves obtaining information from the public and then presenting options to a “literate public and to policy makers” (Director J). Director J argues that this course is central to the curriculum because it foregrounds the ways in which rhetoric develops this expertise. The study of rhetoric in society can reveal the ability and responsibility of written discourse to mediate issues and delineate effective strategies for intervention when there are competing interests. Students might examine issues such as healthcare, the environment, access to technology, and the values embedded in particular technologies, with a focus on the way in which discourse shapes these issues and their expression in society.

Rhetoric in society is a topic embedded in classical discussions. These concerns were explored by figures such as Aristotle, Isocrates and Quintillian. Seminars in classical rhetoric often survey major figures, themes and theories. The Rhetoric in Society course at Director J’s program is pivotal because it “emphasizes the applications of rhetoric to contemporary public issues, such as science and the environment, education, transportation, funding of the arts, and other such issues
that any society must negotiate.” Tying classical and contemporary concerns is achieved by exploring texts such as Aristotle’s *On Rhetoric*, Takis Poulakos’ *Speaking for the Polis: Isocrates’ Rhetorical Education*, and Quintilian’s *The Orator's Education, V, Books 11-12*.

According to Director J, in the course students learn by “reading and developing their understanding of rhetorical theory; by observing and describing practices of negotiating policy through language, not just through single texts but in the multiple texts produced as people investigate and report on issues; and by analyzing the rhetoric of a particular public issue.” The list of primary and supplementary texts for this course is quite extensive, but in order to analyze texts for their research projects, it is necessary. Below is just an example of some of those texts.


I include this list of course texts here, as well as in the discussion of other responses to this question, because such lists offer direction in a number of different ways. First, reviewing what programs are requiring students to read and learn provides insight as to what the faculty and program value when fostering student awareness of and preparing them to do civic engagement. It also offers direction for other programs who are attempting to incorporate civic engagement. Finally, by highlighting key texts being used in programs, the field could begin to draw upon an agreed upon course curriculum. Most programs explore classical rhetorical issues and a few books, such as Hirschberg and Bizzell’s *Rhetorical Tradition* or George Kennedy’s *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition*, are texts programs require students to read and learn. Similarly, texts focusing on civic engagement theories could become ubiquitous across programs.

The Rhetoric in Society course requires each student, then, to research a specific public issue, “ranging from local issues such as sewer systems in local creek basins to national issues such as the one that resulted in the 9/11 report.” Their papers present analyses of how the texts and the writing of those texts both create and respond to the social context of the problem. This research experience is ideal for preparing students for future faculty work in civic engagement because research interests developed in the course and guided by faculty can lead to action research as junior faculty members. Student projects are yet another theme that emerged in responses to question four and those are explored later in this section.
Program Changes:

Directors report that they are making students aware of and preparing them to incorporate civic engagement because of changes taking place within the program. These can be changes to program mission statements or goals, to required reading on the preliminary exam reading list, and to the curriculum of individual courses. Director G provided helpful details in how his/her program is making and implementing such changes to its mission statements or program goals. The faculty updated both its goals and learning outcomes in the 2008-2009 academic year “so that Service Learning is one of the options featured to detail this general statement: “Graduates are prepared to teach a range of rhetoric and composition courses. Besides first-year writing classes, graduates have experience with at least one of these . . . .” The Service Learning line that follows that goal lists these as some relevant options people might use to document their service learning experience: ‘Workshops by the university service-learning program; Service learning teaching; Course projects; etc.’” Flexibility is necessary with civic engagement preparation because there is such a range in how one can do public engagement. By allowing students to choose their opportunities, this program has created a better opportunity for the doctoral students to engage in public scholarship successfully. As discussed earlier in Chapter Two, programs inculcated with civic engagement principles focus student work on, as Marback offers, “crafting research claims within composition studies that take account of public imperatives” (839). Director G’s program clearly demonstrates what Marback states is the goal of such program changes: “to enable students to discern and represent to a range of audiences the greater common good served by composition research” (839).

Faculty at Director G’s program also made changes to their General Preliminary Exam reading list in 2008-2009. A new section was added on “Composition Studies and Engagement.”
According to Director G, the “readings tend [to] reflect the broad idea of community engagement held by faculty in the program.” The following publications are an example of some of those readings:


Highlighting these texts is beneficial in grounding and contextualizing the civic engagement and public research the field has been doing since the early 1990s. It also demonstrates the range in scholarship of engagement and other civic engagement activities taking place by rhetoricians and studied by graduate students.

Finally, Director G stated that “[e]ngagement is working its way into the curriculum as faculty feature it in program seminars.” Seminar topics range from scholarly publishing, computer mediated writing, and writing assessment to the teaching of writing. One persistent example of engagement manifesting in the curriculum is the Computer Mediated Writing course: “For years, the teacher of this course has shared with students an enthusiasm for digital
community service.” In the 2006 offering of the Scholarly Publishing course, Scholarship of Engagement “was highlighted as part of the tenure/promotion context future faculty should be aware of; in 2008, that emphasis became stronger and more detailed.” Similarly, since 2006 service learning has been incorporated in the program’s Teaching of Writing seminar. “[T]his course has assigned an article dealing with service learning, and some students have used a final unit-development project to experiment with service learning approaches in writing classes.” Course projects from other courses have also emphasized engagement in other areas of the field, such as writing program administration and writing assessment. This is, in part, due to the emphasis of the courses. “The 2008 offering [of Writing Administration Work and Its Evaluation] included a substantial emphasis on scholarship of engagement as part of the tenure/promotion context, and “engagement” possibilities of writing programs and WPAs were highlighted. For instance, one of the course projects--on which someone worked and reported to class three times--had the title ‘The Engaged First-Year Writing Program.’” Similarly, the 2009 offering of Writing Assessment “is giving at least one student the opportunity to apply assessment approaches in the area of service learning.” Director G expects that “such developments will continue and expand within course requirements” because s/he has “recommended that we offer a special-topics course on Engagement in Composition and Rhetoric (or some such title).” Director G expects that “it will come to fruition over the next year or so.”

Changes in programs such as this one indicate a number of different things. First, the changes point to how programs can easily incorporate civic engagement so that students are made aware and prepared simultaneously. Second, the changes indicate the field’s continued commitment to remain relevant and engaged. Finally, these changes, especially in course
offerings, demonstrate how students are able to apply theory in course projects. These seminars have provided doctoral students an invaluable environment to explore civic engagement in their projects, and this is the focus of the following section.

Student Projects:

For many of the programs that responded to this questionnaire, civic engagement is not explicitly part of course work or a requirement of the program. Programs that did not explicitly tie civic engagement to the program curriculum did report that students are made aware through projects they’ve created, which often involve action research or focus on civic issues. An example of this emerges from Director B who reported that “many students create projects that involve some form of civic engagement. (i.e., working with local k-12 schools on academic literacy projects and bridge programs between secondary schools and colleges, teaching/researching in migrant worker education programs, many of our student projects are bi-lingual/multilingual projects that involve civic issues that cut across cultures, including Mexican, Hmong, and Chinese).” Faculty support is especially pivotal in these instances because it creates an environment where students may explore such topics while receiving expert guidance from those who already have civic engagement experience.

For those programs where civic engagement is a component in the core courses, it is important that students do research that further supports civic engagement with off-campus programs designed by faculty and community members. For one program, Director H’s program, students often do this as part of externally funded grants. Director H explains that much of this work centers on sustainability in agriculture and energy. A primary example is research done by our research group on science, technology and
society. One project is the CEAH "Public Scholarship" grant with [our program’s faculty]. This trains two doctoral students and involves working with farmers and with public organizations including an upcoming interview with the Fort Dodge farm reporter on his radio show and next November participating in the Soil and Water Conservation Directors annual program as a speaker.

In addition to this, the research done as course projects discussed above leads to a number of dissertations that then involve civic engagement projects, as action research. Because Ph.D. students often continue to work with their dissertation research well into their faculty careers, this experience as doctoral candidates is especially important in preparing them to continue such public research.

Director M concurs with this assertion: “The service learning 101/102 sections, poetry in the schools, and writing center initiatives all provide graduate students with opportunities to explore teaching and (in a few cases) research that they may carry forward into their later careers.” One example that Director M offered involves a graduate student who “devised a service-learning ENGL 101 section on homelessness that has become part of her teaching dossier.” This teaching experience, which linked civic engagement with composition pedagogy, is important in preparing students for future faculty work because doctoral students are able to use these experiences as topics of articles and conference papers, which then can be presented at national conferences, such as CCCC. Creating this kind of link between application, experience and scholarship is common in faculty work. The doctoral student Director M mentions above did just that and is “now applying for a grant to rethink the course for next fall.” And I would add that she gained invaluable preparation for future work.
Another example that Director M offered clearly demonstrates how students are prepared to do civic engagement and what they did after graduation. Several students designed service-learning sections for the freshman composition classes that focused on environmental issues. They went on to teach similar courses and to “devise service-learning programs in the tenure-track jobs they took after graduation.” Earlier in this discussion, Director M mentioned the poetry in the schools program. This kind of outreach program can also lead to unique teaching opportunities for doctoral students. For example, students involved with the poetry in the schools program “have found interesting summer teaching opportunities teaching creative writing to kids and teenagers at arts camps, summer academic programs (such as Duke TIPS), etc.” Faculty who value civic engagement and have incorporated civic issues in their research on campus also typically conduct community work outside of their faculty roles. Creative writing summer camps and other such programs are an ideal way to get involved in community work off-campus, and gaining experience as a graduate student, like that discussed by Director M, is just another way programs can prepare students.

*Faculty Projects:*

Directors’ responses also emphasized learning by example because it is also another way that programs are not only making students aware of civic engagement but also preparing them for incorporating civic concerns in their future faculty work. Graduate students turn to faculty members in their program for support and guidance. Faculty who have incorporated civic engagement in their scholarship can offer years of experience and expertise for students interested in such endeavors. Director H offered a useful example of this. Although the civic engagement and scholarship concerning science, biofuels, environment and research involve
faculty only, the work is often reported to students. For example, Director H stated that “faculty members have received numerous grants to do research and outreach on sustainable agriculture, water, and energy—communication in, with, and among stakeholders on these issues (public understanding of and involvement with science policy). These efforts are shared with students as examples in their work.” Faculty members are essential in creating a culture of engagement. For that very reason, AASCU argues that faculty “[l]eadership through example is particularly important” because their behaviors demonstrate the importance of good practice with regard to pursing engaged rhetorical work (18).

*Electronic Environments:*

Another interesting theme that emerged in how programs are making students aware of or preparing them to incorporate civic engagement involves the use of electronic environments. Directors reported that students are using online tools to foster engagement and to explore civic issues in digital environments. Director F explained that the “required internship course includes readings regarding civic engagement and discussions are conducted, usually, online.” Similarly, Director N’s program offers a course on “cyberculture [which] does inform students of how people use the Internet to engage in social and political movements and can prepare students for civic engagement in electronic environments.” As discussed earlier when I explored the definitions directors provided, the Internet and other digital technologies continue to emerge and serve as vehicles for enhancing civic involvement in rhetoric and composition. Three specific important areas of rhetoric and composition doctoral student preparation involve literacy, computer-mediated communication, and community service. This focus is apparent in current scholarship such as Alison Regan and John Zuern’s recent article “Community-Service Learning
and Computer-Mediated Advanced Composition: The Going to Class, Getting Online, and Giving Back Project,” and will certainly continue as technologies continue to redefine how we conceptualize the rhetoric of partnerships.

*Naturally Engaged Programs:*

One final theme that emerged from responses to question four involves a belief commonly shared among programs. That is, rhetoric and composition as a field is naturally engaged. Director I typified this belief and responded that his/her program did make students aware of /prepared them to incorporate civic engagement, but “[n]ot to be snarky about it, but how could graduate seminars in rhetoric or composition avoid civic content (unless we ditched the past few decades of scholarship)? Our courses in composition theory, rhetoric, and new media all – by the very nature of the discipline – include such content.” Other programs expressed a similar sentiment but just worded it differently. Director K stated that it was “safe to say that civic engagement is embedded into most of our doctoral coursework – however not by caveat. Rather, it is a value this faculty shares, and we extend that into our course designs.” Because other responses from Director K are brief and no other follow-up was possible, it cannot be determined if this program thinks as Director I – that the very nature of the discipline involves civic functions. I would not disagree that civic concerns are central to the field, but I would not automatically assume that it is inherently engaged. Although faculty may value civic engagement, that does not indicate or translate to successful civic engagement awareness or preparation in courses or through other program activities. Because rhetoric could be defined as historically engaged public and civic discourse, I think people misconstrue this to mean the field
and all its work is inherently engaged. In fact, rhetoric is inherently public oriented. But there is a clear distinction between civic engagement activity and public-focused concerns in rhetoric.

*Impact of Directors’ Civic Engagement Work on Program*

The fifth question of the questionnaire asked directors if their work with civic engagement had changed the program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work. Ten of the sixteen directors (nearly 63%) reported that their work with civic engagement had not changed the program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work. However, there were a number of contributing factors influencing these answers. Most directors seemed to report no influence because the programs were initially designed with a civic engagement agenda or because the programs just aren’t there yet. Table 7 below shows how respondents answered this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Director</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>No – always engaged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>No – always engaged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>No – always engaged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>No – but helped motivate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>No, because of other influences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>No – always engaged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Students – yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty - no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lack of change in program understanding of doctoral education and faculty work may be caused by time and budget constraints. Lack of student interest and the challenge of generating it may also stall program changes. Perhaps it is just that consciousness has not been raised regarding the issue. Directors N and P reported that their work with civic engagement had not had an impact yet. “[B]ut it may down the road,” according to Director P because of future plans. “I’m currently developing a volunteer program that would get professors and grad students at several universities in the area to teach after-school voluntary mini-courses in the public high schools.” The work that Director P is doing just may raise the program’s awareness of civic engagement and that could then lead to changes. Director N’s program faces a different set of challenges. It isn’t that faculty aren’t aware or interested because “[t]here are faculty who would like to push the program into dealing more with civic engagement, so this may happen. But the problems of finding time to do this and generating interest among students has made this a low priority.”

On the other hand, Director M’s program has changed student’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work. There hasn’t been any challenge generating student interest. Among faculty, there has been a challenge because certain faculty work is rewarded and valued while work contributing to the public good is viewed as “un-academic.” It isn’t that the rhetoric and composition faculty don’t see the usefulness of theoretical and historical understandings of rhetoric in its relationship to civic participation. However, I think that most faculty in the department still see actual research and practice in civic engagement/community involvement/service learning, etc. as interesting, but ultimately un-academic activities that should be done in students' spare time rather than as an integral part of their degree work. (Director M)
If faculty don’t view engaged work as integral in students’ work, then they certainly won’t value it in their own. This is a significant hurdle and one that is often the problem with incorporating civic engagement practices as discussed earlier in this chapter.

Other directors reported no change because the programs were initially designed with a civic engagement agenda. For Director H, the faculty in his/her program came to “view rhetoric in more consciously political terms under the influence of post-modern and cultural studies.” However, s/he was uncertain whether it was the “civic engagement or the raised consciousness of it in the field that came first.” This kind of dialogic relationship was shared with other respondents, such as Director D because s/he and her/his program have never had a “‘non-civic engagement’ view.” Directors A and B more clearly defined this dialogic relationship. Director A’s program is an education school, “so engagement has always been on the table.” Similarly, with Director B, the “multilingual aspects of writing in our program shape an orientation toward engagement with local and regional communities.” Other educational aspects within programs influence how they view rhetoric and civic activity. The implications in the responses from Directors A and B are that rhetoric and civic engagement are indivisible. Because of this, the field needs to stress civic activities. This need is clearly communicated in Director F’s response. The faculty at this program planned the curriculum to include civic engagement from the beginning. They “already had an understanding of the need for civic engagement.” Because of this, the program is writing civic engagement into its strategic goals for faculty. Director F also added, “It seems to me that any program that teaches rhetoric would need to emphasize civic responsibility.” I think this quote returns to the common belief that rhetoric is inherently engaged, as some directors discussed in earlier responses. Because of this tradition, some directors also reported that their programs hadn’t been changed by faculty civic engagement
work, but their work has served as motivation for smaller changes. Mostly, this is due to faculty anticipating new opportunities.

Director H reported that s/he and other faculty work helped to “motivate us to fine-tune our program and work with students.” These fine-tuning efforts created new opportunities for faculty, students, and how scholarship is evaluated in his program.

I think the faculty in this program have seen in the evolving engagement movement a new expression of rhetoric and composition’s longstanding connections with civic and public issues and new opportunities for faculty to interact productively with communities (on campus and beyond) in service of public good. Increasingly, I think, faculty are highlighting such attitudes for students as part of the climate of faculty work--and tenure/promotion expectations--within which they will work. That is one reason I emphasized curricular developments in the Scholarly Publishing and Writing Administration course; those are two of our courses most explicitly aligned with the Program’s seventh Program Goal (and student learning outcome) which deals with faculty work and the role of scholarship in its evaluation.

Scholarly and professional concerns for civic engagement in higher education can lead to program goals that influence not only the evaluation process of faculty scholarship, but it also impacts mission statements and goals for students. Director J’s scholarly engagement concerns date back to the mid-1990s with the publication of an article that “lays out a taxonomy of approaches to service-learning in college composition classrooms to argue that students need authentic rhetorical situations outside the classroom in order to understand writing as social action.” Director J’s civic engagement work did influence his program’s understanding of doctoral education because “[s]hortly thereafter, as faculty in English began discussions about a
possible Ph.D. program, I based my contributions on Lloyd Bitzer's famous assertion that discourse can be considered rhetorical only if it has the possibility of leading directly to concrete social action.” Because of this, Director J’s mission statement maintains “faculty and students in our Ph.D. program study how rhetoric and writing can contribute to social progress: we examine language use in public settings in a collective effort to engage pressing social and cultural issues. Thus, for me, at least, civic engagement and meaningful scholarship are indivisible.”

Earlier in this chapter, I ended the discussion of the data collected from the *Rhetoric Review* survey with a quote from Andrea Lunsford, and I wrote that we must continue to rethink the Ph.D. program so that it is more connected and engaged. After exploring the data collected from my pilot study, it is clear that rhetoric and composition doctoral programs are preparing students for engaged faculty work. Although the sample size of this study is relatively small, the data provides a rich description of how doctoral programs are preparing new faculty members for engaged and adventurous scholarship that “crosses disciplinary boundaries to foster the kind of interdisciplinary work necessary to address contemporary social problems” (Austin and Barnes 283). Through implied and explicit moves, individual rhetoric and composition doctoral programs are preparing students for faculty careers in which they “value the role of the university [and doctoral program] in serving the public good, understand the range of work that addresses this goal, and know how to engage in scholarly work” (Austin and Barnes 278). However, it is only by becoming more fully engaged that rhetoric and composition Ph.D. programs will better prepare graduate students for work that serves the public good.
Conclusion

Throughout this chapter, I have explored the data collected from both the *Rhetoric Review* survey and my questionnaire. I’ve looked at the themes that emerged from the curricula and director responses of doctoral programs in rhetoric and composition. After reviewing the data, it is clear how programs define civic engagement and how this might impact incorporating public engagement in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs. It is also clear how graduate programs are preparing graduate students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers. Without oversimplifying the challenges writing program administrators face, I would argue that incorporating civic engagement preparation in doctoral education is a balancing act “between conservation and change,” as Carnegie President Lee S. Shulman states. This involves “teaching skepticism and respect for earlier traditions and sources while encouraging strikingly new ideas and courageous leaps forward” (Shulman qtd. in Walker et al.).

Toward the end of Chapter Two, I discussed the 2005 Woodrow Wilson Foundation report titled *The Responsive Ph.D.* I mentioned three of the four themes used to guide the report’s recommendations for rethinking doctoral education. The report recommended that programs sponsor a “more cosmopolitan intellectual experience for doctoral students,” “change their doctoral policy [and] ultimate standards,” “involve […] Ph.D. alumni more substantively in doctoral training,” provide both “departmental and extra-departmental structures […] to cultivate graduate student leadership,” and “expand their approaches to mentoring, such as through team mentoring” (25). These recommendations were made for a number of different reasons. But one primary goal of the recommendations is to “promote public scholarship that applies academic expertise to social challenges” (“Executive Summary” 1).
After reviewing the data from the *Rhetoric Review* survey and my pilot study, it is evident that rhetoric and composition doctoral programs are not only striking a balance between conservation and change, but they are also fostering models of innovation that will provide a more fully engaged preparatory experience for graduate students. Many of those models mirror the recommendations the Woodrow Wilson Foundation outlined. Rhetoric and composition doctoral programs are promoting a cosmopolitan intellectual experience by encouraging graduate students to explore social issues in their research. This encouragement sometimes leads to students incorporating service-learning in the first year composition courses they teach. The encouragement also results in collaborative projects between faculty, graduate students, and community partners. Other programs require students complete citizen scholar programs or have clear partnerships with writing centers and other programs that study rhetoric in society. Arguably, these are examples that echo changes in rhetoric and composition doctoral program policies and the incorporation of extra-departmental structures, such as extern- and internships – as recommended by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation. Now, the discussion leads to my own recommendations based on the data findings.

In Chapter Five, then, I will explore more specific suggestions for encouraging rhetoric and composition graduate student preparation while preserving our meaningful and earlier traditions. This discussion will entail the second part of this research project, which makes a case for how engagement can better be incorporated into rhetoric and composition doctoral education. The third mode that is used, then, is developing the argument (based on my research and textual scholarship from Chapter Two and elsewhere) that bringing engagement more fully into the rhetoric and composition graduate education can better prepare graduates for their future faculty work. In Chapter Five, then, I will also explore the final two research questions of my
project by drawing on the directors’ responses to the final two questions of my questionnaire and current literature to ground my conclusions and recommendations.
Chapter 5: Conclusions and Implications:
Incorporating Engagement in Rhetoric and Composition Doctoral Education

Summary of the Project

“Overall, graduate education is not explicitly preparing students to understand and engage in work for the public good. However, the data suggest that aspiring new faculty members are looking for balance and integration, collegiality, and meaningfulness in their work and lives. Opportunities to learn about and engage in work that explicitly serves the public good could help them achieve these goals.” (Austin and Barnes 277)

…..

The conclusion of this project begins with an epigraph from Ann Austin and Benita Barnes’ 2005 chapter “Preparing Students for Faculty Careers that Contribute to the Public Good” from the edited collection Higher Education for the Public Good. Austin and Barnes highlight the overall weakness of graduate education at preparing students for future engaged work and point to concerns graduate students are anticipating as new faculty members. Both ideas relate to this project which has explored the graduate education of rhetoric and composition students in Ph.D. programs, focusing primarily on how doctoral programs are preparing aspiring new faculty members to learn about and engage in work that serves the public good. At the beginning of this project, I hypothesized that civic engagement activities are taking place within doctoral programs in rhetoric and composition. But the question then became how? Tracing rhetoric’s roots reveals a legacy of the field’s social context – its emphasis of writing in society, forming citizen scholars, and other political concerns. And contemporary scholarship demonstrates the continued link between rhetoric and civic engagement (Cushman, Schutz and
Gere, etc.). However, review of contemporary scholarship revealed very little discussion on how education in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs prepares students for civic engagement in their future faculty lives. This lack of evidence in published scholarship is not surprising considering the civic engagement movement is still relatively new, with most commentators associating it with Boyer’s 1996 article “Scholarship of Engagement.” Clearly, though, there is a need for more scholarship on civic engagement preparation in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs. My pilot study attempted to fill this gap in current research.

Guided by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges’ (NASULGC) Kellogg Commission’s definition of civic engagement, the empirical part of this project consisted of two modes, or parts, of research inquiry. First, data collection involved textual scholarship by examining the curricula offerings as reported in the 2007 Rhetoric Review Survey of the 67 Doctoral Programs in Rhetoric and Composition in the United States. Then, I collected data through my questionnaire, which was electronically distributed to the directors of 70 rhetoric and composition doctoral programs in the United States as listed in the website of the Doctoral Consortium in Rhetoric and Composition. Especially in the questionnaire, the overall sample size was small. Still, I would argue that the findings offer insight not only about current practices but also about how engagement can better be incorporated into rhetoric and composition doctoral education. In both parts of the study, manifestations of civic engagement were identified in the following categories based on themes that emerged from participants’ responses: Curriculum, Program Description/Mission Statement/Goals, Dissertation Title/Focus Area, Core Faculty Research Interest Areas, Definition of Civic Engagement, Prelim Exam Reading Lists, Outside Programs, Program Strengths, and other, miscellaneous activities. In
fact, these categories point to specific opportunities where programs may become more fully engaged and better prepare future faculty for work that serves the public good.

This chapter outlines these specific opportunities/approaches and explores directors’ plans for future civic engagement initiatives to make the case that bringing engagement more fully into the rhetoric and composition graduate education can better prepare graduates for their future faculty work. I do this by offering early recommendations for how engagement can be more fully incorporated into rhetoric and composition doctoral education. This third research mode involves argumentation supported by the larger body of work on engagement as I address the final two research questions:

How might rhetoric and composition doctoral program incorporate and/or promote civic engagement in graduate student preparation?

How might civic engagement preparation for engaged faculty work change our understanding of graduate student preparation and faculty scholarship?

Recommendations for Moving Beyond Encouragement

Based on the data from the Rhetoric Review survey and my questionnaire, it is evident that rhetoric and composition doctoral programs now incorporate some aspects of preparation for engaged work in faculty careers of graduates. As Chapter Four showed, engagement is rarely a required component of doctoral student preparation. But “engaged” elements that are present, I argue here, are a basis upon which rhetoric and composition Ph.D. programs can build to make themselves more fully and engaged and so better prepare graduates for their future faculty work that contribute to the public good. Toward this end, I recommend that rhetoric and composition Ph.D. programs develop:
1. Clearly defined and unified understanding of civic engagement/engaged theories and experiences that directly relate to the program’s mission and goals.

2. Concrete, engaged departmental structures that link composition studies and engagement.


Mission and Goals

Rhetoric and composition Ph.D. programs can become more fully engaged by first clearly defining civic engagement or engaged theories and activities that directly relate to its mission and goals. Early in Chapter Four, I reviewed the mission statements, program descriptions, and goals reported in the *Rhetoric Review* survey. Nearly 48% (or 13 programs) of the 27 programs indicating a civic engagement focus had a clear mission statement or goal that indicated a commitment to civic engagement. Interestingly enough, the programs that had an engaged mission statement typically demonstrated engaged commitments in two to four other categories (see Chapter 4, Table 3). It isn’t possible to speculate whether programs first clearly defined civic engagement or raised the consciousness of it through the mission statement. And it isn’t possible to determine whether the programs with clearly engaged mission statements correspond to the programs in my pilot study who reported clear program definitions of civic engagement. But I would speculate that there is a dialogic relationship at work underscoring the importance of emphasizing rhetoric as “theoretical engagement [and] productive action” (Michigan State University, *Rhetoric Review* survey). The more developed and integrated the definition and mission are regarding engaged practices, the more likely the program will be more fully engaged in other aspects. Paraphrasing MSU’s mission statement, I now argue that programs can become more fully engaged by developing mission statements and corresponding definitions of
engagement that “envision [the program’s and students’] work as taking place at the intersections of scholarship, teaching and service within a range of linguistically and culturally diverse contexts.”

The focus on this intersection would encourage programs to define engagement “not only from the perspective of outreach or programs beyond the curriculum but also in curricular terms” (Director P). This link is important because there are “risk[s] that the term can say everything and nothing at the same time,” as the AASCU warns (8). As I argued in Chapter Four, the lack of a clear definition or mission statement/goal could leave some rhetoric and composition doctoral programs with the impression that they are preparing students to do engagement, when in fact they are not. Director G’s program is a perfect example of the importance of updating a program’s goals. The faculty updated both its goals and learning outcomes in the 2008-2009 academic year so that Service Learning is one of the options featured to detail this general statement: “Graduates are prepared to teach a range of rhetoric and composition courses. Besides first-year writing classes, graduates have experience with at least one of these . . . .” The Service Learning line that follows that goal lists these as some relevant options people might use to document their service learning experience: “Workshops by the university service-learning program; Service learning teaching; Course projects; etc.”

Director G’s program plans to develop and offer greater opportunities for engaged preparation and this change in goals and learning outcomes is a much needed move to achieving this end. Emphasizing the importance of mission statements, goals, and learning outcomes, the AASCU argues that a fully engaged institution or program is characterized by having “mission statements that […] highlight the importance of public engagement” (19).
Department Structures

A second recommendation to follow is to develop concrete departmental structures that link composition studies and engagement. A number of different approaches were reported in the findings in Chapter Four. Programs can provide these concrete departmental structures through required courses or required coursework in an elective class or seminar. As reported in Chapter Four, only Director F reported that his/her program had a required course that included a required “professional or community internship.” Predominantly, most program directors (Directors B, C, J and K, for example) reported that their program does require civic engagement work, but that “none of those classes are required of all PhD students” (Director L). Director H did report that the English 547 class titled “History of Rhetoric (Greeks through Renaissance)” contains civic engagement components that have resulted in student projects that took students outside the university structure. Rhetoric and composition doctoral programs can become more fully engaged by developing specific courses, either required or encouraged, such as Director J’s “Rhetoric in Society” where the focus is on the “[s]tudy of the relationship of language and human action, with emphasis on how rhetoric reflects and shapes social practices and how literate activity operates in a complex society; emphasis on written communication.” This is especially beneficial in making students aware of civic engagement because they learn to “define and explain the social and political functions of rhetoric in classical and contemporary contexts” (Director J). Such courses would require students to research specific public issues, such as the “sewer systems in local creek basins to national issues such as the one that resulted in the 9/11 report” (Director J). The papers generated by a class like this one would present analyses of how the texts and the writing of those texts both create and respond to the social context of the problem. This research experience is ideal for preparing students for future faculty work in civic
engagement because research interests developed in the course and guided by faculty can lead to action research as junior faculty members.

Another way that programs can develop more concrete departmental structures that prepare students for engaged faculty work is through the general preliminary exam reading list. For example, Director G reported that in 2008-2009, his/her program added a new section on “Composition Studies and Engagement.” According to Director G, the “readings tend [to] reflect the broad idea of community engagement held by faculty in the program.” Among other works s/he mentioned were: Ellen Cushman, “The Rhetorician as an Agent of Social Change.”; Christian Weisser, Moving Beyond Academic Discourse: Composition Studies and the Public Sphere.; Nancy Welch, Living Room: Teaching Public Writing in a Privatized World. As mentioned in Chapter Four, it is helpful to highlight the texts programs reported because it offers direction for other programs who are attempting to incorporate civic engagement. Equally, by highlighting key texts being used in programs, the field could begin to draw upon an agreed upon course curriculum.

Another way that rhetoric and composition doctoral programs can draw on to become more fully engaged through concrete departmental structures is by encouraging civic engagement by supporting it in the doctoral students’ teaching. For example, Director E’s program requires students to teach first year composition “which is all about civic engagement through rhetoric. Students study discourses involving civic deliberation and engage in civic discussions themselves. The whole course is about public discourse.” Likewise, director M’s first year composition course also has a required civic engagement component and is taught primarily by the rhetoric/composition graduate students. Director M’s program plans on continuing to support this departmental structure: “We will continue emphasis on rhetorical skill as a precursor
of responsible citizenship and public participation [taught by rhetoric and composition graduate students] in the ENGL 101 and 102 curriculum [and] service-learning sections of ENGL 101/102.” Additionally, director E’s program plans on developing a new class with a civic engagement focus. “[W]e are inventing a new course for doctoral students to teach: Liberal Arts 101: Rhetoric and Civic Life, a course connecting writing, speaking, online communications, and visual rhetoric, all within the public sphere.”

Fully engaged programs can further foster this intellectual experience by encouraging faculty involvement in community-originated initiatives which would carry over into seminars and lectures that provide a “neutral forum for discussing and disseminating information on issues of vital public concern”; and by endowing graduate students with opportunities to apply research “designed to help increase [awareness and] understanding of a problem and/ or test solutions for that problem” (AASCU 9-10). Director K argues the importance of departmental structures to prepare graduate students for engaged faculty work. “It seems to me,” argues Director K, “that our best chance at encouraging civic minded faculty is in a combination of providing exposure, creating opportunities, [and] designing in structured practice […].” Structured practice can occur in a myriad of ways. Working with students on dissertations involving broadly engaged topics, as Director G reported, is one way programs can provide structured practice.

Another form of structured practice and exposure is to create greater opportunities for faculty to mentor students, “such as through team mentoring,” which would allow faculty and students additional opportunities to address theoretical, professional development, or other scholarly concerns (Woodrow Wilson Foundation 25). An example of this kind of mentoring was implied in many of the directors’ responses, but I think the most explicit and detailed
example came from Director H who reported on the head of the Studio for New Media who is engaged in pro bono civic engagement projects. He has served as web developer and webmaster for a number of different community projects. His work then carried over to the classroom where he was able to mentor students in his new media courses who shared similar interests. One particular Ph.D. student then began completing pro bono technology work for surrounding community agencies.

Mentoring can also involve alumni who can help students develop a sense of faculty life and work at different kinds of engaged institutions; they can offer perspectives on teaching load, courses taught, committee work, tenure expectations, and potential scholarship opportunities. The main benefit is that the dialogue generated between graduate students and alumni would provide a “more substantial linkage between theory and practice than might otherwise be presented in a traditional setting” (AASCU 12). Mentoring would also help to keep the rhetoric and composition doctoral curriculum more current and responsive. One of the greatest challenges doctoral programs face is relevancy; as Gerard Hauser asserts, “the challenge of creating such a discursive practice ties scholars and teachers of rhetoric to their forbears, who in each age have had to confront the consequences of changing conditions for the viability of rhetorical practices [because] [t]oday’s conditions may be remarkably dissimilar from those of past ages” (12). Although none of the programs explicitly mentioned alumni mentoring, the pro bono work Director H mentioned also involved a Ph.D. student hosting and maintaining a website developed by a student for her MA creative component. He volunteered to keep the site going once she graduated. Interaction between recent graduates, alumni and current graduate students offers additional opportunities for graduate students in rhetoric and composition Ph.D. programs to be better prepared for future faculty work.
Extra-Departmental Structures

In addition to departmental goals and structures aimed at preparing graduates to pursue engaged work as faculty members, rhetoric and composition Ph.D. programs can develop extra-departmental structures that foster direct, two-way interaction with communities, on campus and beyond. These structures would concretely link theory and practice. By extra-departmental programs, I refer to educational experiences that do not take place in the rhetoric and composition doctoral program. These might include internships or externships. For example, Director I reports that his/her program “will likely develop more opportunities for graduate students to gain more experience for non-academic fields, via internships/externships [which] may blossom into something more.” A rhetoric and composition Ph.D. program can begin with basic intern- and externship experiences and then further develop those into programs that will be discussed later. For instance, Director M’s program also collaborates through “poetry in the schools, [and] writing center outreach to the community.” The benefit of extra-departmental structures, such as an intern- and externships, is that rhetoric and composition graduates will have developed the potential to make “fruitful interdisciplinary linkages [and] the cross-fertilization of ideas” (AASCU 12). Austin and Barnes concede that “[m]any societal problems require interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary perspectives, so graduate students would do well to work with colleagues in other disciplines and appreciate different ways of framing and researching problems” (280). Although the authors focus on developing graduate student research skills in the quote above, they speak to the skills students also develop by learning and teaching in community programs, such as Director M’s poetry in the schools, or Director E’s Liberal Arts course, which encourage graduate students teaching the course to appreciate cross-disciplinary theories whilst framing the learning within a rhetorical context.
As mentioned earlier, rhetoric and composition Ph.D. programs can also extend graduate student preparation to external programs by developing or working closely with centers that connect the study of writing with the community. For example, Director K’s program is currently developing a “Center for Research on Writing with an explicit community-based arm.” In a like manner, Director J’s Ph.D. program already “works very, very closely with our department’s Center for the Study of Rhetoric in Society. The Center has a number of civic engagement initiatives at work which our PhD students contribute to directly and substantially as research assistants […].” The center’s central research question is “How do texts (digital, print, multimedia, visual, verbal) and related communication practices mediate knowledge and action in a variety of social and professional contexts?” The more fully engaged rhetoric and composition doctoral programs should and will cultivate such questions to advance engaged extra-departmental experiences where students will be able to gain more useful experiences involving public engagement.

By interacting with centers such as Director J’s, the more fully engaged program will also better prepare graduate students for collaborative and individual scholarship, as well as to “engage [in] a variety of methodologies to study issues of rhetoric and representation surrounding social problems and their solutions” (Director J). Some of the methods Director J’s center uses include “discourse analysis, semiotics, ethnography, and historical investigation.” It isn’t that current rhetoric and composition doctoral programs don’t teach their graduate students to use the same methodologies in their research. The distinction is that the fully engaged program will couple these methodologies with topic areas of public concern. For example, Director J’s Center for the Study of Rhetoric in Society is currently working in the following topic areas: “energy efficiency, risk, sex equity and the law, literacy, displacement, institutional
history, race, poverty, and social entrepreneurship.” And it is this kind of engaged, extra-departmental learning experience that better prepares students for a faculty career of “informed and participatory citizenship” (AASCU 12).

Doctoral students graduating from fully engaged programs will be better prepared for faculty work because they will have had opportunities to develop and articulate what Director F characterizes as a leading citizen scholar. He emphasizes the importance of the “public intellectual’s responsibility to engage with the community [and] the importance of articulating a personal ethic.” In other words, doctoral students will be better prepared because they will have already more fully developed their own theories, as well as a relationship, to community issues and civic engagement in their scholarly work before entering the field as a new faculty member. As Director M asserted in Chapter Four, these “initiatives provide graduate students with opportunities to explore teaching and […] research that they may carry forward into their later careers.” By interacting with community agencies, as well as other academic programs, students will also be better prepared because they will already hold an appreciation of the particular missions of different rhetoric and composition programs, as well as each specific, different institutional type – such as community colleges, liberal arts colleges, comprehensive institutions and others (Austin and Barnes). Then, when they take a position in a rhetoric and composition program at a comprehensive university, for example, “new faculty members will have enough awareness to inquire about how the institution’s mission relates to regional employment and social needs and how they can relate their own work to those […] missions and commitments” (Austin and Barnes 279).

The same is true with interaction between community constituents and rhetoric and composition doctoral programs. The dialogue will help doctoral students to appreciate the
various missions and goals of specific community agencies, and, therefore, the collaboration with these constituents better prepares the new faculty member to relate how the community site’s mission not only relates to community needs but the academic research being conducted. I would argue that the programs discussed earlier – such as Director M’s outreach program/poetry in the schools and Director J’s Transformative Graduate Education program which includes the Preparing the Future Professoriate/Professional, Graduate Education Development Institute, and the Citizen Scholar program – not only clearly link the programs’ mission and values to social needs, but also prepare doctoral students for careers in a range of institutions and programs. Austin and Barnes agree that doctoral students should gain some understanding of the “essential purposes and core values” of the field contextualized in larger institutions of higher education (278). Similarly, I argue that more fully engaged rhetoric and composition doctoral programs better prepare doctoral students because the program will have developed and required more explicit opportunities for doctoral students, similar to the few outlined in Chapter Four, to cultivate an awareness of different missions of different institution types, an appreciation of the field’s role in public service, and an understanding of where they can locate their own research interests within the larger institution and community context.

It is not realistic to expect rhetoric and composition Ph.D. programs to immediately integrate all three recommendations I am advancing in this discussion. But given the extent of engagement reported in the Rhetoric Review survey and my questionnaire, it seems clear that programs would have richer, more comprehensive preparation for engagement if they worked to have fully engaged mission statements/goals tied with a concrete definition of engaged
activities/civic engagement, and having fully engaged departmental and extra-departmental structures that link composition theory with engaged practices.

Changing the Nature of Doctoral Education

Up until this point, I have explored specific recommendations that I argue rhetoric and composition doctoral programs should incorporate in order to be more fully engaged and better prepare graduate students for engaged faculty work. The discussion now leads to how engaged preparation for faculty work changes faculty understanding of graduate student preparation and faculty scholarship. I would argue that engaged preparation in rhetoric and composition doctoral education changes how we discuss graduate student work and preparation and faculty scholarship.

Currently, there seems to be a mismatch or divide between traditional faculty work, which is viewed as academic, and student work, which is viewed more as exploratory, developing. Although doctoral programs encourage a certain level of collaboration between faculty and students, the relationship isn’t a balanced two-way interaction. Some of this imbalance can’t be avoided simply by the fact that most faculty have been working in the academy for longer periods of time when compared to the time doctoral students have been in graduate school. What I am suggesting is that engaged preparation changes how we conceptualize the work an academic does before obtaining the Ph.D. and after securing a new faculty position. I am also suggesting that engaged preparation changes how we conceptualize the collaboration between faculty and doctoral students. If, as Director J stated, we believe that “the study of rhetoric and civic engagement are inseparable,” in other words, if composition
theory and engaged practice are inseparable, then our understanding of graduate student preparation and faculty work/scholarship should also be a dialogic relationship.

Civic engagement and other forms of engaged preparation create a dialogic relationship such that graduate student preparation/scholarly work informs faculty work/scholarship. This relationship wouldn’t merely be a matter of influence. The dialogue extends in both directions between graduate student and faculty. This dialogic work is two-fold: both faculty and graduate students must embrace it, and the fully engaged program, then, must provide a supportive environment for faculty and graduate students. By surrounding graduate students with “role models who make [engagement] part of their faculty profiles,” while empowering students to collaborate on equal footing with faculty, the fully engaged program encourages the development of dialogic work for future faculty members (Director K). The more fully engaged program fosters more dynamic dialogue among the faculty and doctoral student so that students can “consider not only the organizational role of the academy in society, but also the roles and responsibilities of those individuals who accept the role of faculty member” (Austin and Barnes 278). A few of the programs identified from the *Rhetoric Review* survey in Chapter Four reported specific core faculty research interest areas that were engaged. Similarly, the data collected from my questionnaire reveals that engagement can be fostered in doctoral student scholarship based on the example set by faculty (for example, Directors H, L and M reported that their programs began to encourage or incorporate civic engagement because of their personal research interests). Interacting with faculty allows students to link the dialogue to their own interests, research and teaching, thereby inviting them to reflect on how this can further contribute to the public good in their own scholarly work. Graduate student work, then, would be viewed as equally academic, and less exploratory or formative, because collaboration with
faculty would be more interactive. Graduate students and faculty alike would occupy the role of learner as well as teacher. Both would look to each other as resources, rather than the faculty member as the one holding the answers. Ultimately, then, engaged preparation changes how we view the scholarly work graduate students conduct during the Ph.D. experience and it changes how we conceptualize the relationship between graduate students and faculty.

Contentions: Objections to Incorporating Engagement

Although the recommendations I am advancing in this project are in line with rhetoric’s legacy of civic involvement touched on briefly in Chapter Two, some contemporary scholars, such as the directors in my pilot study, seem reluctant to encourage the explicit incorporation of engagement in the doctoral curriculum. There are a number of different factors that might cause this apprehension.

The first relates to the relative newness of the engagement movement in higher education, as well as the current doctoral education and program expectations. The rhetoric and writing curriculum already introduces graduate students to the history of rhetoric – its enduring goal to educate citizen scholars for civic life, as well as to matters of literacy important to society. Additionally, doctoral students are exposed to classical rhetoric and also contemporary theory-based courses where their research efforts are linked to public issues but only by sporadic encouragement from faculty. One of the primary goals of rhetoric and composition doctoral education is to help the graduate student develop his/her scholarly research interests and skills with an eye to future faculty tenure expectations, not to help the graduate student learn how to address social problems. Since the current doctoral education meets this goal while loosely
endorsing public engagement, directors and administrators probably do not see any reason to change the rhetoric and composition doctoral program.

At the same time, rhetoric and composition Ph.D. programs may be housed in universities that do not emphasize civic engagement. Until recently, Director N’s university did not put much emphasis on civic engagement, service learning, or extracurricular activities. But “because our assessment for re-accreditation shows that few of our students in general get involved with out-of-class organizations and activities,” the university is now planning to give emphasis to engaged activities. Director N speculates that this “may create an atmosphere to support civic engagement initiatives in the doctoral program […]”

Another barrier to incorporating civic engagement in the doctoral program is budgetary. As programs (and universities) tighten their purse strings during the current economic recession, activities viewed as less academic, such as engaged practices and research, are either restricted, cut, or delayed. Director I confirms that his/her program probably will not plan to incorporate any engaged preparation “until we get through the current budget crisis.”

Some directors also object to incorporating engagement preparation – specifically, requiring any engagement activities by graduate students – because it seems too “coercive” (as Director H argued) and programs do not want to “over-require” students (Director I). In fact, Director I expanded on this in his/her response to the final question of my questionnaire where I asked directors to add any other thoughts regarding their program’s efforts to prepare doctoral students for engaged faculty work. S/he explained that “Our program has intentional[ly] shied away from programmatic efforts to channel our students through pre-designed paths. While we do require knowledge of the discipline, we don’t force particular issues.” Director I raises an important concern, but as the Woodrow Wilson Foundation’s “Executive Summary” of The
*Responsive Ph.D.* highlights, “since the 1990s, many observers have called for change in doctoral education […] [but] doctoral education must change, can change, and is already changing in creative, effective ways,” such as requiring that rhetoric and composition doctoral education “promote public scholarship that applies academic expertise to social challenges” (1).

In addition to concerns of over-requiring graduate students, some directors object to civic engagement because of the added requirement expectation of faculty. Director M states

Rhetoric and composition faculty typically have such strenuous service loads that I hesitate to say that civic engagement should be viewed as a necessary part of work in the field. Rhet/comp is an incredibly broad field, and I think that each person must develop his or her own relationship to community and civic involvement in his or her work. Faculty members like me, who have a strong interest in such work, should be encouraged to do it, to be sure—and such work, when it includes a research component, should be counted towards tenure, promotion, etc. However, it’s perfectly possible to have a productive and worthy faculty career in rhet/comp without devoting a big part of one's work explicitly to community engagement.

Director M also addresses several important concerns regarding rhetoric and composition Ph.D. programs becoming more fully engaged. Civic engagement is just one of many terms used throughout this project to point to the kind of scholarship Boyer endorsed in his 1996 article “Scholarship of Engagement” when he wrote that “abundant evidence shows that both the civic and academic health of any culture is vitally enriched as scholars and practitioners speak and listen carefully to each other” (145). Although I agree that civic engagement should not be a necessary part of faculty work, I would argue that engaged scholarly activities and civic-mindedness should be. Certainly, “community work” conceptualized as some simple
interchange where academics enter a community site to do service is not being argued for in this project. As Director G observed in his/her final response to my questionnaire, engagement is something that includes but is far broader than “civic engagement.” The term you use in your dissertation title – “contributions to the public good” – seems a much better way to try to understand how doctoral programs are preparing students for future careers as teachers, scholars, and administrators. This is my own professional view but also, I think, one that aligns with the broad engagement emphasis of this program.

Indeed, this project is arguing for more engaged preparation in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs “by continuing interchange with the worlds beyond academia. To become more relevant and garner more support, the doctorate must open to the world and engage social challenges more generously” (Woodrow Wilson Foundation “Executive Summary” 1). Although the project has been guided by the term “civic engagement,” from the onset a very broad definition was used to delineate the term. As discussed in earlier chapters, civic engagement can involve a faculty member or graduate student’s “teaching, research, and extension and service functions” where they are “sympathetically and productively involved with their communities, however community may be defined” (NASULGC 27). Involvement with a community can be as general as exploring a social problem or addressing a social phenomenon through scholarly writing, or involvement can be as explicit as developing service-learning projects in graduate courses that “test new models and approaches and/ or apply ‘best practice’ to issues within community settings” (AASCU 9). Because engagement is such a broad concept, directors of rhetoric and composition doctoral programs should certainly develop and employ the model that best aligns with their particular program and institution rather than completely shy away from engaged theories entirely because one particular term doesn’t fit with their mission.
or goals. By following the recommendations in this discussion for rhetoric and composition faculty and graduate student work, we can, as Jerry Gaff argues in “Preparing Future Faculty and Multiple Forms of Scholarship,” “be optimistic that the next generation of professors will be able to learn about the breadth and complexity of modern scholarship in their formative years, so that they can contribute to multiple forms of scholarship and gain satisfaction in doing so throughout their academic years” (70).

Further Study

Throughout this project, I have used various terms – such as civic engagement, engagement, public engagement, public good – to argue for greater emphasis on engagement in rhetoric and composition graduate student preparation. The program descriptions and the directors’ responses reveal that doctoral education employs a broad range of engaged theories and experiences to prepare rhetoric and composition graduate students for an equally broad range of scholarly work that benefits society. In making sense of engaged faculty work, I find Cornel West’s handling of the “public intellectual” in *The Future of the Race* highly relevant. He writes, “The fundamental role of the public intellectual – distinct from, yet building on, the indispensable work of academics, experts, analysts, and pundits – is to create and sustain high-quality public discourse addressing urgent public problems which enlightens and energizes fellow citizens, prompting them to take public action” (Gates and West 71). West’s definition of the public intellectual dovetails nicely with rhetoric and composition’s longstanding mission of addressing discourse production in society. Clearly, doctoral programs must continue to more fully encourage and provide engaged opportunities to prepare rhetoric and writing students for faculty work that benefits society.
The future of this dissertation project lies in a more thorough exploration of engaged experiences in rhetoric and composition doctoral education. This pilot study provided an early framework of how rhetoric and composition Ph.D. programs prepare graduate students for faculty work that benefits society. Revising the questionnaire so that the term “civic engagement” is replaced with a broader term, such as “engagement” or “public good,” would certainly help elicit more expansive data. Similarly, taking more aggressive steps to extract a larger sample of responses in future research would certainly help paint a richer picture of current rhetoric and composition doctoral student preparation. A possible extension of this pilot study could be a revision of the current study questionnaire with greater emphasis placed on graduate student projects. Looking at how students utilize their civic engagement-focused teaching and research experiences and carry that forward into new faculty careers would encourage further inquiry into best practices for graduate student preparation. It would also encourage inquiry into the changing landscape of scholarship and faculty work in more fully engaged rhetoric and composition Ph.D. programs. A final possibility for future research lies in exploring engaged preparation in digital environments (as briefly discussed in Chapter Four). Allan Luke questions “How will literacy be redefined in relation not only to the emergence of digital technologies but also to the emergent, blended forms of social identity, work, civic and institutional life […]” (qtd. in Schultz 369). Certainly literacy will be redefined; but rhetoric and composition Ph.D. programs, and how they prepare graduate students, will also certainly be redefined.

Conclusion

The growing tension between “higher education’s current movement toward a capitalistic, self-centered agenda” and “its responsibility to larger society” (Quaye 299) marks
the need for rhetoric and composition doctoral programs to face the fundamental issue of how best to prepare its graduates to respond to the needs of its citizens. Becoming more fully engaged seems a natural progression for the field’s doctoral programs. The programs reported in the data for this project indicate that multiple opportunities and approaches need to be more deeply embedded in the field’s doctoral student preparation if students are to successfully link theory to practice. This will allow us not only to reaffirm the field’s legacy of promoting civic discourse but also, as Henry Giroux said of education broadly, to redefine “the power of questioning authority, recover the ideals of engaged citizenship, reaffirm the importance of the public good, and expand [the field’s] capacities to make a difference” (450).
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APPENDIX A:
INFORMED CONSENT AND QUESTIONNAIRE

Informed Consent for Writing Program Administrator

Stephanie M. Anderson  
Graduate Student  
English Department  
Bowling Green State University  
Bowling Green, OH 43402  
stemand@bgsu.edu

Preparing Doctoral Students in Rhetoric and Composition for Faculty Careers that Contribute to the Public Good

Introduction and Background Information

You are invited to participate in a research study. The study is being conducted by Stephanie M. Anderson from the Bowling Green State University Department of English as part of her dissertation. The hypothesis of this research is that civic engagement activities are taking place within doctoral programs in rhetoric and composition. There are many definitions of civic engagement. For this research study, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges’ (NASULGC) Kellogg Commission will provide the basis of the definition: “By engagement, we refer to institutions that have redesigned their teaching, research, and extension and service functions to become even more sympathetically and productively involved with their communities, however community may be defined” (2000, p.13). Your participation in this study will consist of completing one brief survey/questionnaire.

Purpose

The purpose of this research study is to understand if and how a specific institution is incorporating civic engagement practices in the preparation and education of rhetoric and composition graduate students. This study will include a brief questionnaire for the administrators in rhetoric and composition doctoral programs to complete.

Procedures

During the spring semester 2009 a survey will be electronically sent to directors of rhetoric and composition doctoral programs for them to complete anonymously and return.

By completing the survey, directors will be giving permission to use their responses, which will help to answer how a rhetoric and writing program is incorporating civic engagement practices.

Potential Risks
There are no foreseeable risks associated with this study.

Benefits

The possible benefits of this study include a better understanding of how civic engagement practices are being incorporated in doctoral student preparation in rhetoric and composition. The research findings may aid in the development of civic engagement initiatives in doctoral programs, more involvement of doctoral students in service learning programs, and scholarship of engagement for future faculty members in rhetoric and composition. While the information collected may not benefit you directly, the information learned through this study may be helpful to future graduate students, teachers of writing, and directors of rhetoric and composition doctoral programs.

Confidentiality

Although absolute confidentiality cannot be guaranteed, confidentiality will be protected to the extent permitted by law. Pseudonyms will be used to refer to specific administrators or programs. Only this researcher will have access to the information you provide, and your identity will not be revealed in any published results unless you specifically request identification.

Voluntary Participation

Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You are free to withdraw your consent at any time without penalty.

Research Subject’s rights and Contact Persons

You acknowledge that all your present questions have been answered in language you can understand and all future questions will be treated in the same manner. If you have any questions about the study, please contact Stephanie Anderson (cell): 419.277.0966 or (email): stemand@bgsu.edu. You can also contact Dr. Richard Gebhardt, my project advisor, at richgeb@bgsu.edu.

If you have questions about the conduct of this study or your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Chair of Bowling Green State University's Human Subjects Review Board at (419) 372-7716 (hsrb@bgsu.edu).

Consent

By completing and returning the electronic survey, link below, you agree that you have read and understood the above information and hereby consent to voluntarily participate in this study. Upon completion of this survey, please clear your web browser’s cache and page history. You also agree that you have been given a copy of the consent.
Questionnaire

Instructions: Complete the following questionnaire about your doctoral program’s efforts to prepare students to incorporate engagement in their future faculty careers (for instance, how it works to prepare students for faculty positions at institutions that in the words of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges’ Kellogg Commission: “... have redesigned their teaching, research, and extension and service functions to become even more sympathetically and productively involved with their communities, however community may be defined.”) Some questions may be answered with “yes” or “no” followed by brief information or explanation. Please use as much space as needed to complete your responses. Upon completion of this survey, please remember to clear your web browser’s cache and page history. Please contact me if you have any questions. And thank you for taking the time to help me in my research.

--Stephanie Anderson (stemand@bgsu.edu)

1. How do you or your rhetoric and composition doctorate program define civic engagement?

2. Does your rhetoric and composition program require doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? Does it encourage doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? If you answered “yes” to either or both questions, could you give some brief details?

3. If you answered “yes” in question 2, how long has your program been requiring or encouraging civic engagement by doctoral students?

4. Do courses or requirements in your doctoral program make students aware of civic engagement and prepare them to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers? Could you give some brief details?

5. If you answered “yes” in question 2 and/or question 4, has your work with civic engagement changed your program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work?

6. If you answered “no” in question 2 or question 4, does your doctoral program have plans for future civic engagement initiatives? Could you give some brief details?

7. Do you have other things to add about your program’s efforts to prepare rhetoric and composition doctoral students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?
Appendix B:

Directors’ Responses

Director A

1. How do you or your rhetoric and composition doctorate program define civic engagement?

We do not specifically define it. It arises in relation to students’ projects and interests.

2. Does your rhetoric and composition program require doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? Does it encourage doctoral students to participate in civic engagement?

If you answered “yes” to either or both questions, could you give some brief details?

No particular requirement or formal encouragement beyond being responsive to students’ interests. A number of students do come with awareness of the social power of writing and some come with overt political interests. Others come with interests in public sphere processes. Others have interests in writing in socially responsive professions.

3. If you answered “yes” in question 2, how long has your program been requiring or encouraging civic engagement by doctoral students?

As long as students express such interests, we support exploration and projects.

4. Do courses or requirements in your doctoral program make students aware of civic engagement and prepare them to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers? Could you give some brief details?

We have a course in the history of writing and the organization of society that makes such
connections explicit. Also the course in lifelong development of writing looks at adult uses of writing in the community.

5. If you answered “yes” in question 2 and/or question 4, has your work with civic engagement changed your program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work?

As we are in education school, engagement has always been on the table.

6. If you answered “no” in question 2 or question 4, does your doctoral program have plans for future civic engagement initiatives? Could you give some brief details?

No Response

7. Do you have other things to add about your program’s efforts to prepare rhetoric and composition doctoral students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?

Insofar as they have included that in their interests, projects, development, they continue with that.

**Director B**

1. How do you or your rhetoric and composition doctorate program define civic engagement?

Civic engagement includes activities that reach outside the university setting. Civic engagement is also an issues-related activity; it aims to make the local community (and perhaps the world) a
better place.

2. Does your rhetoric and composition program require doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? Does it encourage doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? If you answered “yes” to either or both questions, could you give some brief details?

Civic engagement is not required, but it is encouraged.

3. If you answered “yes” in question 2, how long has your program been requiring or encouraging civic engagement by doctoral students?

Our program began in Fall 2009. We have encouraged civic engagement since the program began.

4. Do courses or requirements in your doctoral program make students aware of civic engagement and prepare them to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers? Could you give some brief details?

Civic engagement for PhD students in Writing Studies is not explicitly part of course work or a requirement; however, many students create projects that involve some form of civic engagement. (i.e., working with local k-12 schools on academic literacy projects and bridge programs between secondary schools and colleges, teaching/researching in migrant worker education programs, many of our student projects are bi-lingual/multilingual projects that involve civic issues that cut across cultures, including Mexican, Hmong, and Chinese)).

5. If you answered “yes” in question 2 and/or question 4, has your work with civic
engagement changed your program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work?

The multilingual aspects of writing in our program shape an orientation toward engagement with local and regional communities.

6. If you answered “no” in question 2 or question 4, does your doctoral program have plans for future civic engagement initiatives? Could you give some brief details?

No plans for more formal mechanism of developing civic engagement.

7. Do you have other things to add about your program’s efforts to prepare rhetoric and composition doctoral students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?

No Response

**Director C**

1. How do you or your rhetoric and composition doctorate program define civic engagement?

Our program has no official definition. As for me, it would be hard to conceive of any work that we do in the program that does not involve civic engagement. Teaching, learning, writing and reading all involve engagement with society. But that is probably too broad. So how about civic engagement as involvements beyond the campus, whether they are instructional, collaborative, or service oriented.
2. Does your rhetoric and composition program require doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? Does it encourage doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? If you answered “yes” to either or both questions, could you give some brief details?

No program requirements. Occasionally I will teach a course that includes service learning or a course that has an option for volunteering in the community for credit. TAs in our program can design and teach service learning courses. TAs in our Writing Center can volunteer to be assigned to community satellite writing center. Our Center for the Humanities also has a program in which graduate students can propose and be funded for some sort of collaboration with a community organization or school that brings together teaching/learning and the grad student's research interest. These grants are competitive.

3. If you answered “yes” in question 2, how long has your program been requiring or encouraging civic engagement by doctoral students?

I have had a "civic engagement" component in some of my courses since the mid 1990s. The Humanities Center grants program is about 3 years old. The Writing Center satellite is about 5 years old. TAs have been offering service learning courses for 5 or 6 years.

4. Do courses or requirements in your doctoral program make students aware of civic engagement and prepare them to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers? Could you give some brief details?

Some of us cover service learning research in our course readings. (I do in the intro to comp studies class). After that, learning is informal through staff development, reading circles, and stuff like that.
5. If you answered “yes” in question 2 and/or question 4, has your work with civic engagement changed your program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work?

No, not really.

6. If you answered “no” in question 2 or question 4, does your doctoral program have plans for future civic engagement initiatives? Could you give some brief details?

No new ones are on the horizon. We have discussed having a seminar given to service learning but it hasn't been created nor is it scheduled to be taught.

7. Do you have other things to add about your program’s efforts to prepare rhetoric and composition doctoral students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?

No.

**Director D**

1. How do you or your rhetoric and composition doctorate program define civic engagement?

any activity that sends students or faculty into the community or asks them to bring community artifacts/knowledge/resources into the classroom.
2. Does your rhetoric and composition program require doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? Does it encourage doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? If you answered “yes” to either or both questions, could you give some brief details?

no.

3. If you answered “yes” in question 2, how long has your program been requiring or encouraging civic engagement by doctoral students?

No Response

4. Do courses or requirements in your doctoral program make students aware of civic engagement and prepare them to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers? Could you give some brief details?

n/a

5. If you answered “yes” in question 2 and/or question 4, has your work with civic engagement changed your program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work?

No Response

6. If you answered “no” in question 2 or question 4, does your doctoral program have plans for future civic engagement initiatives? Could you give some brief details?

we are not working on this kind of initiative at this time.
7. Do you have other things to add about your program’s efforts to prepare rhetoric and composition doctoral students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?

No Response

**Director E**

1. How do you or your rhetoric and composition doctorate program define civic engagement?

We don't define it as a program, but have a general conceptual definition that's not controversial. For time reasons, I'm not going to try to define it here.

2. Does your rhetoric and composition program require doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? Does it encourage doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? If you answered “yes” to either or both questions, could you give some brief details?

Our students teach first year composition, which is all about civic engagement through rhetoric. Students study discourses involving civic deliberation and engage in civic discussions themselves. The whole course is about public discourse. Our tech writing courses (which many doctoral students teach) involves service learning. Doctoral students themselves are not required to do civic engagement themselves.

3. If you answered “yes” in question 2, how long has your program been requiring or encouraging civic engagement by doctoral students?

Three decades. We've always emphasized public discourse in the teaching that our doctoral
students do.

4. Do courses or requirements in your doctoral program make students aware of civic engagement and prepare them to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers? Could you give some brief details?

Only by virtue of their experiences as teachers of first-year writing.

5. If you answered “yes” in question 2 and/or question 4, has your work with civic engagement changed your program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work?

No Response

6. If you answered “no” in question 2 or question 4, does your doctoral program have plans for future civic engagement initiatives? Could you give some brief details?

Only in the sense that we are inventing a new course for doctoral students to teach: Liberal Arts 101: Rhetoric and Civic Life, a course connecting writing, speaking, online communications and visual rhetoric, all within the public sphere.

7. Do you have other things to add about your program’s efforts to prepare rhetoric and composition doctoral students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?

No Response
1. How do you or your rhetoric and composition doctorate program define civic engagement?

We define civic engagement as any reciprocal literacy activity between faculty/student and the community.

2. Does your rhetoric and composition program require doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? Does it encourage doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? If you answered “yes” to either or both questions, could you give some brief details?

Yes, one of our required courses, at all program levels, is a professional or community internship.

3. If you answered “yes” in question 2, how long has your program been requiring or encouraging civic engagement by doctoral students?

Our program is now 5 years old and the internship has been part of the curriculum from the beginning.

4. Do courses or requirements in your doctoral program make students aware of civic engagement and prepare them to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers? Could you give some brief details?

Our required internship course includes readings regarding civic engagement and discussions are conducted, usually online. I do not teach that course, so I don't have details.
5. If you answered “yes” in question 2 and/or question 4, has your work with civic engagement changed your program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work?

Since we planned for our program to include civic engagement from the very start, we already had an understanding of the need for civic engagement. It seems to me that any program that teaches rhetoric would need to emphasize civic responsibility. We are also writing civic engagement into our program's strategic goals for faculty.

6. If you answered “no” in question 2 or question 4, does your doctoral program have plans for future civic engagement initiatives? Could you give some brief details?

n/a

7. Do you have other things to add about your program’s efforts to prepare rhetoric and composition doctoral students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?

I know that in the graduate courses I teach, I emphasize the public intellectual's responsibility to engage with the community. I stress the importance of articulating a personal ethic.

**Director G**

1. How do you or your rhetoric and composition doctorate program define civic engagement?

This program has a broad concept of “engagement,” including civic engagement of many kinds, scholarship of engagement (which is highlighted in promotion/tenure documents across our
whole university), and writing about public issues and problems. Official manifestations of this broad approach shows in readings suggested in the “Composition Studies and Engagement” section of our prelim list (more detail included elsewhere) and in our recent revision of Program Goals to mention service learning as an option for students. More importantly, I think, individual faculty are committed to engagement in their own professional lives. For instance: ☐ One faculty member has been involved for years in such computer-oriented activities as programs in an area retirement community, a computer camp for sixth grade girls, and online efforts at faculty development with other institutions and our campus. ☐ One person has worked with students on dissertations involving such broadly engaged topics as writing as therapy for the seriously ill, dual high-school/college writing instruction, and post-9/11 trauma rhetoric and pedagogy. ☐ One person has had scholarship of engagement as a key research interest for several years and he has moved information from this research into graduate seminars (more detail included elsewhere). This person also has advised a dissertation on scholarship of engagement and encouraged student interest in service learning as a professional direction and dissertation topic. ☐ One person is now exploring ways to connect undergraduate language arts students with teachers in the community. This person also encourages students interested in service learning (and other civic engagement) to do projects on those topics in courses in Writing Assessment and in Research Methods.

2. Does your rhetoric and composition program require doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? Does it encourage doctoral students to participate in civic engagement?

If you answered “yes” to either or both questions, could you give some brief details?

The program does not require student participation in civic engagement. The program does not
require student participation in civic engagement. It encourages students with an interest in civic engagement to develop those interests, for instance by taking courses offered by the Education College, workshops led by the university’s Service Learning program, doing projects in appropriate courses, doing dissertations relating to civic engagement--and to other, broader aspects of “engagement.” My reference to dissertations, there, prompts me to add a note. The answer to Q-1 mentioned a number of dissertations on broadly “engaged” topics. Some more explicitly engaged dissertation work has been completed or begun. Several years ago, a student began a dissertation (completed in 2008-2009) with the title Rhetoric and the Scholarship of Engagement: Pragmatic, Professional, and Ethical Convergences. In 2008-2009 a student began work on a dissertation titled "Preparing Doctoral Students in Rhetoric and Composition for Faculty Careers that Contribute to the Public Good." And a first-year student currently is doing a service learning related project in the Writing Assessment course thinking about doing a dissertation dealing with service learning.

3. If you answered “yes” in question 2, how long has your program been requiring or encouraging civic engagement by doctoral students?

Our encouragement efforts have been going on going on for several years. I would say they are picking up momentum as more faculty feature civic and other engagement in graduate seminars and, especially, with changes (described later) in Prelim Exam reading list and our first Program Goal.

4. Do courses or requirements in your doctoral program make students aware of civic engagement and prepare them to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future
faculty careers? Could you give some brief details?

I think so, for three different reasons. 1. During the 2008-2009 academic year, the faculty updated its first Program Goal (and student learning outcome) so that Service Learning is one of the options featured to detail this general statement: “Graduates are prepared to teach a range of rhetoric and composition courses. Besides first-year writing classes, graduates have experience with at least one of these . . . .” The Service Learning line that follows that goal lists these as some relevant options people might use to document their service learning experience: “Workshops by the university service-learning program; Service learning teaching; Course projects; etc.” 2. Also in 2008-2009, the faculty added a new section on “Composition Studies and Engagement” to the General Prelim Exam reading list. The recommended readings tend reflect the broad idea of community engagement held by faculty in the program: Ellen Cushman, “The Rhetorician as an Agent of Social Change.” College Composition and Communication 47.1 (Feb 1996): 7-28. Thomas Deans, Writing Partnerships: Service Learning in Composition (NCTE, 2000). Linda Flower, Community Literacy and the Rhetoric of Public Engagement. Southern Illinois UP, 2008. Jeffrey Grabill, Writing Community Change: Designing Technologies for Citizen Action. Hampton Press, 2007. Christian Weisser, Moving Beyond Academic Discourse: Composition Studies and the Public Sphere. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2002. Nancy Welch, Living Room: Teaching Public Writing in a Privatized World. Boynton/Cook, 2008. 3. Engagement is working its way into the curriculum as faculty feature it in program seminars. For example: Scholarly Publishing: In the 2006 offering of this course, Scholarship of Engagement was highlighted as part of the tenure/promotion context future faculty should be aware of; in 2008, that emphasis became stronger and more detailed. Computer Mediated Writing: For years, the teacher of
this course has shared with students an enthusiasm for digital community service. Writing Administration Work and Its Evaluation: The 2008 offering included a substantial emphasis on scholarship of engagement as part of the tenure/promotion context, and “engagement” possibilities of writing programs and WPAs were highlighted. For instance, one of the course projects—on which someone worked and reported to class three times—had the title “The Engaged First-Year Writing Program.” Writing Assessment: The 2009 offering is giving at least one student the opportunity to apply assessment approaches in the area of service learning. Teaching Writing: Since 2006, this course has assigned an article dealing with service learning, and some students have used a final unit-development project to experiment with service learning approaches in writing classes. My expectation is that such developments will continue and expand within course requirements. I have recommended that we offer a special-topics course on EngagementS in Composition and Rhetoric (or some such title), and I expect that it will come to fruition over the next year or so.

5. If you answered “yes” in question 2 and/or question 4, has your work with civic engagement changed your program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work?

I don’t think so, other than to help motivate us to fine-tune our program and work with students. I think the faculty in this program have seen in the evolving engagement movement a new expression of rhetoric and composition’s longstanding connections with civic and public issues and new opportunities for faculty to interact productively with communities (on campus and beyond) in service of public good. Increasingly, I think, faculty are highlighting such attitudes for students as part of the climate of faculty work—and tenure/promotion
expectations—within which they will work. That is one reason I emphasized curricular developments in the Scholarly Publishing and Writing Administration course; those are two of our courses most explicitly aligned with the Program’s seventh Program Goal (and student learning outcome) which deals with faculty work and the role of scholarship in its evaluation.

6. If you answered “no” in question 2 or question 4, does your doctoral program have plans for future civic engagement initiatives? Could you give some brief details?

No Response

7. Do you have other things to add about your program’s efforts to prepare rhetoric and composition doctoral students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?

Several times above, I have spoken of “engagement” as something that includes but is far broader than “civic engagement.” The term you use in your dissertation title—“contributions to the public good”—seems a much better way to try to understand how doctoral programs are preparing students for future careers as teachers, scholars, and administrators. This is my own professional view but also, I think, one that aligns with the broad engagement emphasis of this program.

Director H

1. How do you or your rhetoric and composition doctorate program define civic engagement?

We don’t have an official definition at Iowa State University or in our program, but the
definition you gave provides a good description of the broad way we construe the term and the practices. We do not, however, construe it to mean requiring students to perform civic benefit projects (that would seem to some of us coercive). Nor do we define civic engagement as sympathetic and productive involvement with their professional communities, as everything we do promotes that, we hope!

2. Does your rhetoric and composition program require doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? Does it encourage doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? If you answered “yes” to either or both questions, could you give some brief details?

Our Ph.D. in RPC encourages doctoral students to participate in civic engagement but does not require it specifically in the materials. But it is part of two of the four core courses. Engl. 547, History of Rhetoric (Greeks through Renaissance) spends four weeks on Isocrates, Cicero, Quintilian, and the classical conception of civic virtue. Course projects that have come out of this tradition include high school projects to increase student participation in extra-curricular activities, first-year composition units involving attendance at city council meetings, guidelines for local business in diversity policies, and proposals to enhanced equity for graduate students. Greg Wilson, who is responsible for the required methods course, informally mentors students in their qualitative and ethnographic research for their dissertations and has helped establish software resources for graduate students for the analysis of interviews and qualitative data. Having been a rhetorician working at Los Alamos National Lab, he knows the importance of working with and within communities to facilitate, study, and perform valuable work. He work with at ISU to think about the active roles they
can take in communities that are important to them.

3. If you answered “yes” in question 2, how long has your program been requiring or encouraging civic engagement by doctoral students?

We have encouraged civic engagement from the beginning of the program in 1991, but that emphasis became greater with the creation of our ISUComm program, which places emphasis on new media. Much of that comes from the example set by the faculty. For instance, the head our Studio for New Media is very much engaged in pro bono civic improvement projects. - Webmaster, Ames Historic Preservation Commission. Helped to design a system for an Ames, Iowa city agency which researches the history of local architecture and protects historically significant buildings. http://ahpc.eserver.org/ - Webmaster, Telling the Stories of Fayette County. Designed website and flew down to the University of Memphis to train students and faculty on oral history interviewing/recording best practices, for the development of an oral history website capturing the stories from a difficult time in the Civil Rights movement in rural Tennessee, east of Memphis. http://fayettestories.eserver.org/ - Web Developer, Good Neighbor Emergency Assistance. Helped to develop a content management system for a nonprofit organization that coordinates assistance and relief for residents of Ames, Iowa living in or near the poverty level, to help them find and/or keep their housing. Pro bono technology work with groups here in Iowa is common with our Ph.D. students as well. - A few years ago, a team of RPC/RCPC students worked with the Olive Tree Project, a collaborative effort between ISU’s public policy and administration program and small cities in Boone and Poweshiek Counties. The project explored how small communities can share local services while
retaining their independent identities. The team (Rob Glazebrook, Amy Striker, Sara Smith, and Quinn Warnick) created a visual identity, designed documents, and built a website for the project. The project has been completed and the website is no longer online, but you can find some of the artifacts they created here:

http://plus.quinnwarnick.com/portfolio/olivetree.html - One of our graduate students, Quinn Warnock, hosts and maintains the website for the Central Iowa chapter of the National Alliance on Mental Illness. The website was created by Amy Striker for her MA creative component in the RCPC program, and Quinn volunteered to keep the site going when she graduated. The site is located here: http://namiofci.org

4. Do courses or requirements in your doctoral program make students aware of civic engagement and prepare them to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers? Could you give some brief details?

In addition to the civic engagement component in the core courses mentioned above, Ph.D. students are encouraged to do research that supports civic engagement. They often do this as part of externally funded grants. This being Iowa and Iowa State University, much of this work centers on sustainability in agriculture and energy. A primary example is research done by our research group on science, technology and society. On project is the CEAH "Public Scholarship" grant with Jean Goodwin, Lee Honeycutt and Greg Wilson. This trains two doctoral students and involves working with farmers and with public organizations including an upcoming interview with the Fort Dodge farm reporter on his radio show and next November participating in the Soil and Water Conservation Directors annual program as a speaker. Other forms of civic engagement and scholarship concerning science, biofuels,
environment and research involve faculty only. For example, faculty members have received numerous grants to do research and outreach on sustainable agriculture, water, and energy—communication in with and among stakeholders on these issues (public understanding of and involvement with science policy). These efforts are shared with students as examples in their work. In addition, a number of dissertations have involved civic engagement projects, as action research.

5. If you answered “yes” in question 2 and/or question 4, has your work with civic engagement changed your program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work?

Like many in the profession, our faculty has come to view rhetoric in more consciously political terms under the influence of post-modern and cultural studies. I couldn’t guess whether it was the civic engagement or the raised consciousness of it in the field that came first. I suspect it was a dialogic relationship, I suspect.

6. If you answered “no” in question 2 or question 4, does your doctoral program have plans for future civic engagement initiatives? Could you give some brief details?

No Response

7. Do you have other things to add about your program’s efforts to prepare rhetoric and composition doctoral students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?
Director I

1. How do you or your rhetoric and composition doctorate program define civic engagement?

As a program, we don't define Civic Engagement, or it'd be more accurate to say that we don't deploy it as a term with a fixed meaning or strict parameters. Do we encourage civic activity, civic literacy, civic research? Depends on the student and the project. Personally, I define civic engagement as doing work (broadly defined) off campus.

2. Does your rhetoric and composition program require doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? Does it encourage doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? If you answered “yes” to either or both questions, could you give some brief details?

No, we don't have any specific requirements for civic participation. We try not to over-require our students to do much, encouraging individuals instead to define a path for their scholarly careers and pursue them with diligence, tenacity, and honesty. Through our undergraduate/composition curriculum, we DO encourage our graduate-student faculty to teach courses with a civic component, service learning portion, or something related to public discourse.

3. If you answered “yes” in question 2, how long has your program been requiring or encouraging civic engagement by doctoral students?

More than 6 years of encouraging civic engagement through our comp. curriculum. Probably 8.
4. Do courses or requirements in your doctoral program make students aware of civic engagement and prepare them to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers? Could you give some brief details?

Sure. Not to be snarky about it, but how could graduate seminars in rhetoric or composition avoid civic content (unless we ditched the past few decades of scholarship)? Our courses in composition theory, rhetoric, and new media all--by the very nature of the discipline--include such content.

5. If you answered “yes” in question 2 and/or question 4, has your work with civic engagement changed your program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work?

Not sure I understand the question. It sounds directed more toward programs that have a well-defined programmatic agenda or program requirement for civic engagement.

6. If you answered “no” in question 2 or question 4, does your doctoral program have plans for future civic engagement initiatives? Could you give some brief details?

We will likely develop more opportunities for graduate students to gain more experience for non-academic fields, via internships/externships. Those may blossom into something more.

7. Do you have other things to add about your program’s efforts to prepare rhetoric and composition doctoral students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?
Our program has intentional shied away from programmatic efforts to channel our students through pre-designated paths. While we do require knowledge of the discipline, we don't force particular issues.

**Director J**

1. How do you or your rhetoric and composition doctorate program define civic engagement?

The PhD program in Rhetoric and Writing at Virginia Tech focuses on rhetoric in society. We study language use and rhetorical activity in public, academic, corporate, and governmental settings, in a collective effort to engage pressing social and cultural issues from the perspective of rhetorical and writing studies. As faculty at a land-grant university, we seek students who want to engage in research into how rhetoric and writing can contribute to social progress, how literate practices create, circulate and prioritize societal values and the public policies based on those values, and how rhetoric and writing empower and control access to power in these social systems. Our collective research agenda addresses rhetorical and social problems in such areas as # science and technology, # diversity and difference, # the environment, # scholarly inquiry, # medicine and disability, # education, # civic engagement, and # globalized communication and commerce.

2. Does your rhetoric and composition program require doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? Does it encourage doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? If you answered “yes” to either or both questions, could you give some brief details?

http://www.grads.vt.edu/graduate_school/tge/cse/index.html Citizen Scholar Experience The Vision Transformative Graduate Education (TGE) is an initiative introduced by the Graduate
School at Virginia Tech to expand and modernize the graduate experience. TGE is comprised of three main interconnecting elements: the Preparing the Future Professoriate/Professional (PFP2) program, the Graduate Education Development Institute (GEDI), and Citizen Scholar Engagement (CSE). Together, these three components enhance the preparation of and better equip Virginia Tech graduate students with knowledge and the skills needed for meaningful and relevant contributions to the 21st century. A typical graduate student experience usually is composed of three main elements: research, coursework, and teaching. These three components often take place within the closed and over-simplified university environment. Thus graduate students frequently move through their graduate education with very little practical experience or interaction with the real world. How ironic it is that institutions of higher education continue to prepare students for service in the world by sheltering them within the walls of small classrooms and cramped laboratories. Citizen-Scholar Engagement (CSE) at Virginia Tech is a program designed to give graduate students an opportunity to utilize their academic skills and knowledge in a real-world setting. It is hoped students who participate in the experience will gain "public scholarship" - scholarship in service to the community, the state, the nation, and the world. Community-based collaborative projects, leadership training opportunities, "global" seminars, and a variety of similar activities prepare the student to serve in varying capacities. Participants in the program take the scholarship they gain in school and apply it as good citizens. Thus they become "Citizen Scholars."

3. If you answered “yes” in question 2, how long has your program been requiring or encouraging civic engagement by doctoral students?

Our PhD has just finished its second year of operation. We have been encouraging civic
engagement from the very beginning of the program.

4. Do courses or requirements in your doctoral program make students aware of civic engagement and prepare them to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers? Could you give some brief details?

Rhetoric in Society ENGL 6334 I — Catalogue Description
Study of the relationship of language and human action, with emphasis on how rhetoric reflects and shapes social practices and how literate activity operates in a complex society; emphasis on written communication.

(3H, 3C) Course Number: 6334 ADP TITLE: Rhetoric in Society II — Learning Objectives
Having successfully completed this course, students will be able to: • Define and explain the social and political functions of rhetoric in classical and contemporary contexts • Explain the “public sphere” as well as the roles rhetoric plays in it • Explain the role of argumentation in professional discursive practices, especially in written discourse • Understand and practice rhetorical analysis as a means of inquiry • Define research questions that explore uses of rhetoric in formulating public opinion • Analyze, in writing, the role of rhetoric in creating meaning in the social contexts in which professional and public discourse occur

III - Justification
A democratic society, its values, and its policies are shaped by the literate practices that generate, circulate, and apply knowledge. Rhetoric enables citizens to negotiate issues of policy and define the values of the society in which they live. Its power lies in the realm of uncertain knowledge. While the sciences and engineering develop technologies and processes that enable a society to function, rhetoric provides the means for formulating policies regulating uses of these technologies and processes. Through systematic means of inquiry, rhetoric enables citizens and their representatives to answer questions such as these: What are the priorities? Who has
access to power? Who are the stakeholders? What might be the long-term consequences? What constraints limit our ability to develop new ideas? These questions and their answers depend on and develop the values of the society. It is in the best interest of society to have people who are expert in asking questions about short-term and long-term effects of decisions, in thinking strategically about how to arrive at the answers (including getting information from the public), and in presenting options to a literate public and to policy makers. This course is central to the curriculum because it foregrounds the ways in which rhetoric develops this expertise. The study of rhetoric in society can reveal the ability and responsibility of written discourse to mediate issues and delineate effective strategies for intervention when there are competing interests. Students might examine issues such as healthcare, the environment, access to technology, and the values embedded in particular technologies, with a focus on the way in which discourse shapes these issues and their expression in society. Whereas ENGL 6314, Classical Rhetoric, offers a survey of major figures, themes, and theory, this course emphasizes the applications of rhetoric to contemporary public issues, such as science and the environment, education, transportation, funding of the arts, and other such issues that any society must negotiate. In this course, students will learn by reading and developing their understanding of rhetorical theory; by observing and describing practices of negotiating policy through language, not just through single texts but in the multiple texts produced as people investigate and report on issues; and by analyzing the rhetoric of a particular public issue. Each student will research a specific public issue, ranging from local issues such as sewer systems in local creek basins to national issues such as the one that resulted in the 9/11 report; their papers will present analyses of how the texts and the writing of those texts both create and respond to the social context of the problem. Because of the emphasis on theory and research and the seminar style of the course, the course
5. If you answered “yes” in question 2 and/or question 4, has your work with civic engagement changed your program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work?

My scholarly and professional concern for civic engagement and higher education goes back to the mid-1990s, as well, when I wrote and published "Rhetoric Made Real: Civic Discourse and Writing Beyond the Curriculum," a piece which lays out a taxonomy of approaches to service-learning in college composition classrooms to argue that students need authentic rhetorical situations outside the classroom in order to understand writing as social action. Shortly thereafter, as faculty in English began discussions about a possible PhD program, I based my contributions on Lloyd Bitzer's famous assertion that discourse can be considered rhetorical only if it has the possibility of leading directly to concrete social action. Thus, as our mission statement maintains, faculty and students in our PhD program study how rhetoric and writing can contribute to social progress: we examine language use in public settings in a collective effort to engage pressing social and cultural issues. Thus, for me, at least, civic engagement and meaningful scholarship are indivisible.

6. If you answered “no” in question 2 or question 4, does your doctoral program have plans for future civic engagement initiatives? Could you give some brief details?
Our PhD program works very, very closely with our department's Center for the Study of Rhetoric in Society. The Center has a number of civic engagement initiatives at work which our PhD students contribute to directly and substantially as research assistants:

http://www.rhetoric.english.vt.edu/projects/projects.html

7. Do you have other things to add about your program’s efforts to prepare rhetoric and composition doctoral students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?

We believe that the study of rhetoric and civic engagement are inseparable. Paul Heilker Co-Director of the PhD in Rhetoric and Writing Virginia Tech

**Director K**

1. How do you or your rhetoric and composition doctorate program define civic engagement?

This is a surprisingly difficult question for #1 on a survey. Did you pilot this survey?

2. Does your rhetoric and composition program require doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? Does it encourage doctoral students to participate in civic engagement?

If you answered “yes” to either or both questions, could you give some brief details?

There is no official requirement. However, there is a community ethos we share, and our graduate students become an important part of that ethos. Some come to us for that reason, while others embrace it by the time they leave.
3. If you answered “yes” in question 2, how long has your program been requiring or encouraging civic engagement by doctoral students?

If you mean in their teaching, we have encouraged civic engagement in all levels of our courses for at least 15 years. If you mean as service activities either outside of or as a part of their studies, we have quite recently made the move to recommend more community-building and engagement in a range of partnerships across campus -- within the past 2 years.

4. Do courses or requirements in your doctoral program make students aware of civic engagement and prepare them to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers? Could you give some brief details?

It's safe to say that civic engagement is embedded into most of our doctoral coursework -- however not by caveat. Rather, it is a value this faculty shares, and we extend that into our course designs.

5. If you answered “yes” in question 2 and/or question 4, has your work with civic engagement changed your program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work?

No.

6. If you answered “no” in question 2 or question 4, does your doctoral program have plans for future civic engagement initiatives? Could you give some brief details?

We are developing a Center for Research on Writing with an explicit community-based arm.
7. Do you have other things to add about your program’s efforts to prepare rhetoric and composition doctoral students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?

It seems to me that our best chance at encouraging civic-minded faculty is in a combination of providing exposure, creating opportunities, designing in structured practice, and being surrounded by role models who make it part of their faculty profiles. Good luck with the project!

I hope I’m not too late; this has been the worst semester ever.

**Director L**

1. How do you or your rhetoric and composition doctorate program define civic engagement?

I define civic engagement as the collaboration between writing groups (or individuals) and local/public institutions that results in writing that serves a function for the community/public. Some of my classes do civic engagement projects. Some of my graduate classes read about and think about the impact of constructing writing classes to enact civic engagement. I do civic engagement projects. There is no agreed upon definition by the graduate program, though.

2. Does your rhetoric and composition program require doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? Does it encourage doctoral students to participate in civic engagement?

If you answered “yes” to either or both questions, could you give some brief details?

The program has no requirement of this sort. In some graduate classes students are required to do civic engagement work, but none of those classes is required of all PhD students. For example, in
the practicum for new teachers of Professional Writing, students are required to do a civic engagement project in order to learn how to run one in their classes. The last time I taught the course we developed educational materials to support Adventure Cycling’s Underground Railroad Historical Bicycle Trail. Another example comes from the Archives class. There the students describe collections for the local historical society and then mount an exhibit for the community of materials related to the collections they described. Another example comes from the qualitative research class in which we have students collect oral histories at the state veteran's home. I also encourage dissertation projects that include civic engagement. Currently, two students are working to develop GED materials for the local reading/community literacy center (in collaboration with the teachers and students there) that will be housed online and will give the center greater reach (and support of the community).

3. If you answered “yes” in question 2, how long has your program been requiring or encouraging civic engagement by doctoral students?

I've been here since 1985 and have been doing community projects that whole time in professional writing classes -- both graduate and undergraduate. I was told I was hired because I believed in serving the community, and so I expect the tradition is long indeed.

4. Do courses or requirements in your doctoral program make students aware of civic engagement and prepare them to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers? Could you give some brief details?

answered already
5. If you answered “yes” in question 2 and/or question 4, has your work with civic engagement changed your program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work?

no. I never had a "non civic engagement" view, so it could not change.

6. If you answered “no” in question 2 or question 4, does your doctoral program have plans for future civic engagement initiatives? Could you give some brief details?

No Response

7. Do you have other things to add about your program’s efforts to prepare rhetoric and composition doctoral students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?

I always look to incorporate more and richer experiences in doctoral preparation. But, I have nothing specific I plan to do in this area in the next year.

**Director M**

1. How do you or your rhetoric and composition doctorate program define civic engagement?

Our graduate rhetoric and composition courses engage with a variety of theoretical and historical frameworks for understanding civic engagement as it relates to rhetoric, writing, literacy, and the teaching of writing. In this context, we do not advocate any single definition, but rather, we encourage students to explore the variety of ways in which writing, speaking, and teaching may be connected to public participation. In our first-year composition program, which is the primary
teaching venue for rhetoric/composition graduate students, we integrate two notions of civic engagement into the curriculum: (1) Our English 102 course is grounded in classical rhetoric's understanding of rhetorical training as preparation for civic participation; this course is organized around an Aristotelian definition of rhetoric, supplemented with Toulmin argumentation, to teach students to discover and construct persuasive arguments about contemporary political and social issues; (2) Special sections of both ENGL 101 and 102 include a service learning component, which we define as out-of-class service to community agencies that applies or responds to academic material and skills central to the course's goals.

2. Does your rhetoric and composition program require doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? Does it encourage doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? If you answered “yes” to either or both questions, could you give some brief details?

Aside from requiring that rhet/comp students follow the ENGL 101/102 curriculum described above, there is no requirement. Our English department houses several outreach programs (poetry in the schools, writing center) that create opportunities for graduate students to work in the community. The English graduate student group typically lobbies on behalf of graduate-student interests and needs; they also do a fund-raiser for a local charity and a service project most years. Graduate students are generally encouraged to participate in one or more of these efforts.

3. If you answered “yes” in question 2, how long has your program been requiring or encouraging civic engagement by doctoral students?

There is no requirement. The rhetorical/civic issues curriculum for ENGL 102 has been in place
for about ten years; the poetry in the schools, service learning sections of first-year comp, and writing center outreach have been in place for 8-10 years. I started or co-started all of these initiatives, which grow from my research interests; however, over time they have been integrated into the department's general activities.

4. Do courses or requirements in your doctoral program make students aware of civic engagement and prepare them to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers? Could you give some brief details?

ENGL 102--civic/rhetorical focus--discussed above. The service learning 101/102 sections, poetry in the schools, and writing center initiatives all provide graduate students with opportunities to explore teaching and (in a few cases) research that they may carry forward into their later careers. For example: One comp/rhet minor devised a service-learning ENGL 101 section on homelessness that has become part of her teaching dossier. Her experience in this course became the topic of a conference paper, which she presented at CCC last spring, and she is now applying for a grant to rethink the course for next fall. Another example: Several students who designed service-learning sections of ENGL 101/102 focused on environmental issues have gone on to teach similar courses and devise service-learning programs in the tenure-track jobs they took after graduation. Finally: Several students involved in the poetry in the schools program have found interesting summer teaching opportunities teaching creative writing to kids and teenagers at arts camps, summer academic programs (such as Duke TIPS), etc.
5. If you answered “yes” in question 2 and/or question 4, has your work with civic engagement changed your program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work?

Among students—yes. Among faculty—Rhet/comp faculty see the usefulness of theoretical and historical understandings of rhetoric in its relationship to civic participation. However, I think that most faculty in the department still see actual research and practice in civic engagement/community involvement/service learning, etc. as interesting, but ultimately un-academic activities that should be done in students’ spare time rather than as an integral part of their degree work.

6. If you answered “no” in question 2 or question 4, does your doctoral program have plans for future civic engagement initiatives? Could you give some brief details?

We will continue --emphasis on rhetorical skill as a precursor of responsible citizenship and public participation in our ENGL 101 and 102 curriculum --service learning sections of ENGL 101/102 --poetry in the schools --writing center outreach to the community in our program in the foreseeable future.

7. Do you have other things to add about your program’s efforts to prepare rhetoric and composition doctoral students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?

Rhetoric and composition faculty typically have such strenuous service loads that I hesitate to say that civic engagement should be viewed as a necessary part of work in the field. Rhet/comp is an incredibly broad field, and I think that each person must develop his or her own relationship
to community and civic involvement in his or her work. Faculty members like me, who have a strong interest in such work, should be encouraged to do it, to be sure--and such work, when it includes a research component, should be counted towards tenure, promotion, etc. However, it’s perfectly possible to have a productive and worthy faculty career in rhet/comp without devoting a big part of one's work explicitly to community engagement.

**Director N**

1. How do you or your rhetoric and composition doctorate program define civic engagement?

The rhetoric and composition doctorate program does not have an official definition of civic engagement. My own definition of civic engagement for a rhetoric program would emphasize service learning and rhetorical instruction that stresses the development of students' citizenship.

2. Does your rhetoric and composition program require doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? Does it encourage doctoral students to participate in civic engagement?

If you answered “yes” to either or both questions, could you give some brief details?

No requirement and no explicit encouragement. My feeling is that students’ teaching and study demands probably discourage civic engagement. What encouragement we do give is provided on an individual basis, for example, a professor with an interest in queer studies drawing some students into his community work on AIDS awareness. But this encouragement is sporadic.

3. If you answered “yes” in question 2, how long has your program been requiring or encouraging civic engagement by doctoral students?
4. Do courses or requirements in your doctoral program make students aware of civic engagement and prepare them to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers? Could you give some brief details?

We occasionally offer courses on civic discourse, but these courses haven't been as popular with students as courses on rhetorical theory, history, pedagogy, and technology, and so we don't offer such courses often. A course on cyberculture does inform students of how people use the Internet to engage in social and political movements and can prepare students for civic engagement in electronic environments.

5. If you answered “yes” in question 2 and/or question 4, has your work with civic engagement changed your program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work?

Not yet. There are faculty who would like to push the program into dealing more with civic engagement, so this may happen. But the problems of finding time to do this and generating interest among students has made this a low priority.

6. If you answered “no” in question 2 or question 4, does your doctoral program have plans for future civic engagement initiatives? Could you give some brief details?

Not at the moment, but the university plans to put more emphasis on civic engagement, service learning, and extracurricular activities because our assessment for re-accreditation shows that few of our students in general get involved with out-of-class organizations and activities. That
may create an atmosphere to support civic engagement initiatives in the doctoral program, but probably not until we get through the current budget crisis.

7. Do you have other things to add about your program’s efforts to prepare rhetoric and composition doctoral students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?

No Response

**Director O**

1. How do you or your rhetoric and composition doctorate program define civic engagement?

We don't specifically.

2. Does your rhetoric and composition program require doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? Does it encourage doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? If you answered “yes” to either or both questions, could you give some brief details?

No. No.

3. If you answered “yes” in question 2, how long has your program been requiring or encouraging civic engagement by doctoral students?

No Response
4. Do courses or requirements in your doctoral program make students aware of civic engagement and prepare them to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers? Could you give some brief details?

No.

5. If you answered “yes” in question 2 and/or question 4, has your work with civic engagement changed your program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work?

No Response

6. If you answered “no” in question 2 or question 4, does your doctoral program have plans for future civic engagement initiatives? Could you give some brief details?

No

7. Do you have other things to add about your program’s efforts to prepare rhetoric and composition doctoral students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?

No

**Director P**

1. How do you or your rhetoric and composition doctorate program define civic engagement?

Our doctoral program has made no concerted effort to define "civic engagement." Were we to do
so, I'm sure I'd want us to think about it not only from the perspective of outreach or programs beyond the curriculum but also in curricular terms. To my mind, teachers and students are participating in civic engagement when they explore civic issues through reading, writing, and discussion.

2. Does your rhetoric and composition program require doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? Does it encourage doctoral students to participate in civic engagement? If you answered “yes” to either or both questions, could you give some brief details?

No.

3. If you answered “yes” in question 2, how long has your program been requiring or encouraging civic engagement by doctoral students?

No Response

4. Do courses or requirements in your doctoral program make students aware of civic engagement and prepare them to incorporate civic engagement practices in their future faculty careers? Could you give some brief details?

Our doctoral program requires two courses: "History of Criticism" and "Seminar in Pedagogy." Depending on the teacher, the latter may make students aware of civic engagement. And there are some faculty members who stress civic engagement in elective courses they offer.
5. If you answered “yes” in question 2 and/or question 4, has your work with civic engagement changed your program’s understanding of doctoral education and faculty work?

I don't think it's had that big of an impact yet--but it may down the road. I'm currently developing a volunteer program that would get professors and grad students at several universities in the area to teach after-school voluntary mini-courses in the public high schools.

6. If you answered “no” in question 2 or question 4, does your doctoral program have plans for future civic engagement initiatives? Could you give some brief details?

See #5 above.

7. Do you have other things to add about your program’s efforts to prepare rhetoric and composition doctoral students to incorporate civic engagement in their future faculty careers?

No Response