Literacy, Rhetoric, and Social Practice Graduate Program Handbook

Updated August 19, 2021

Handbook For Graduate Students and Advisors

Program Description

Kent State's doctoral major in Rhetoric and Composition concentrates on the ways literacy practices shape people's lives in educational, workplace, and public spheres. Our coursework emphasizes data-rich and methodologically sophisticated research and prepares students for investigating literacy, rhetoric, and social practice. Collaborative research with faculty, administrative opportunities, and community outreach prepare students to sustain and advance the discipline. Our graduates contribute in meaningful ways to university communities and the larger public sphere.

Graduates will:

- Develop knowledge of the field of Rhetoric & Composition, its application in diverse contexts, and its role in contemporary culture.
- Generate research questions, develop appropriate research designs, and practice ethical modes of inquiry.
- Participate in local and international communities of like-minded scholars and teachers.
- Contribute new knowledge in the field of Rhetoric & Composition

Curriculum Checklists

MA Checklist

General Requirements

Introductory Courses (6 hours)

Requirement	Semester Completed
61000 Introduction to Research	
61094 Introduction to Research in the Teaching of College Writing	
61094 required only for students on appointment	

Area Requirements (12 hours)

Requirement	Semester Completed
Division I Rhetoric & Composition (3 Hours)	
Division II Literary Traditions (6 Hours)	
Division III Critical Studies & Theory (3 Hours)	
Division II or Division III students cannot use: English 6/75031	
Division III Critical Studies & Theory (3 Hours)	
Division II or Division III students cannot use: English 6/75031	

Language Requirement

Requirement	Semester Completed
Language Exam or Course	

Rhetoric & Composition Concentration Requirements

A. Core Courses (3 credit hours, taken in year one)

Requirement	Semester Completed
65012 Reading and Interpreting Research on Writing	

B. Elective Courses (6 hours)

n.b. All Rhetoric & Composition students must take 65035 Linguistics for Rhetoricians either as a Division I Area Requirement, a concentration elective, or an open elective.

Requirement	Semester Completed
65022: Rhetorical Theory: Greek & Roman	
65023: Rhetorical Theory: 18th-20th C.	
65027: Role of Composition	
65035: Linguistics for Rhetoricians	

65051: Literacy: Function, Practices, & History
65052: Writing Activity As Social Practice
65053: Writing Technologies

C. Open Elective (3 hours, graduate level)

Requirement	**Semester Completed**
Elective	
Additional 3 hour Elective if 61094 was not required	

33 Total Hours Required for MA

PhD Checklist

I. Prerequisites (typically satisfied with MA Work)

Requirement	Semester Completed
61094: Introduction to Research in the Teaching of College Writing (3 credit hours)	

II. LRSP Requirements (12 hours)

Requirement	Semester Completed
75012: Reading & Interpreting Research on Writing	
75051: Literacy: Functions, Practices and History	
79022: Greek & Roman Rhetorical Theory	
75044: Research Design	

III. LRSP Section A: Theory (9 hours)

Requirement	Semester Completed
75027: Role of Composition in the Study of Writing	
75023: Rhetorical Theory: 18, 19, 20th Centuries	
85024: Domain Rhetorics and the Construction of Knowledge	
85025: Theories and Systems of Writing and Representation	
75035: Linguistics for Rhetoricians	
85033: Rhetorical Nature and Function of Extended Discourse	
85055: Nature and Relationship of Non/Academic Literacy	
85056: Assessment	

IV. LRSP Section B. Practice (9 hours)

Requirement	Semester Completed
85041: Field Research Methods in Writing	
85042: Discourse Analysis	
75052: Writing Activity as Social Practice	
75053: Writing Technologies	
85054: Studies in Literacy and Community	
85057: Rhetorical Methods	

V. Other relevant coursework

Requirement	Semester Completed
By choice or as a result of completing the MA in R/C at KSU	

30 TOTAL MINIMUM HOURS BEYOND THE M.A.

PhD Four-Year Plan

The LRSP doctoral major requires:

- 30 seminars hours beyond the M.A.
- Passing the Qualifying examinations
- Completion of the Dissertation.

LRSP Advising activity is integrated throughout the program.

The following timeline sets out the typical program plan for completion of the degree in four years:

Time	Activity / Benchmarks
Fall, 1st Semester	• Take ENG 75012: Reading and Interpreting Research on Writing • Take 1 or 2 other seminars (1 or both should be "LRSP Requirements" seminars) • Review Program requirements
Spring, 2nd semester	• Take 2 or 3 seminars (all students should take 5 per year). Be mindful of the requirement to take 9 hours each in Sections A & B in the Program Requirements. • Meet with LRSP co-chair for advising
Fall, 3rd semester	• Take 2 or 3 seminars (all students should take 5 per year)
Spring, 4th semester	• Take remaining seminars (all students should complete 30 hours of coursework) • Assemble your Qualifying Examination Committee • Prepare a short description of your anticipated dissertation project for Qualifying Exam committee • Develop reading lists and rationales for Qualifying Exams with the advice of your exam committee • Begin preparing for the Qualifying Examinations
Fall, 5th semester	• After coursework, register for 8 hours of Research • Prepare for and take Qualifying Examinations • After completing exams, enroll for Dissertation I hours (15 hours per semester for 2 semesters) • Form Dissertation Committee • Begin drafting the Prospectus, meeting with Dissertation Committee throughout the drafting process

Spring, 6th semester	• File Prospectus in time to be eligible for Departmental Fellowships • Begin conducting research and drafting of the dissertation • Enroll in Dissertation I hours (15 hours per semester for 2 semesters)
Fall, 7th semester	• Enroll in Dissertation II hours (after completing 30 Dissertation I hours) • Continue to write dissertation • Distribute Dissertation chapters to Director and Committee • Apply for jobs; MLA Job Information List published in October but job ads often appear earlier
Spring, 8th semester	• File for graduation early in semester • Complete dissertation and defend

Academic Standing Policy

In order to remain in good academic standing with the University, students must make satisfactory progress towards the degree. Policies for adequate progress vary by stage in the program in accord with University Policy. LRSP program faculty will annually review student progress according to the criteria listed in subsequent sections. If a student is delinquent in one or more criteria, LRSP faculty may issue a warning, or in more serious cases, recommend probation or dismissal, according to University Policy. Students who are placed on probation should follow University policy for returning to good academic standing.

Coursework

_ Remain continuously enrolled in coursework
*barring University approved leave of absence
_ Maintain at least a 3.0 GPA each semester

Preparing for Exams

_ Assemble a qualifying exam committee prior to the completion of coursework
_ Complete your exam prior to the end of your 3rd year in the program (so that you may submit your prospectus before the 3rd year deadline)
_ Meet with the members of your exam committee to approve reading lists and any other preparations faculty suggest (such as writing practice questions or writing practice answers, etc.)

If exams are not passed, you may still make adequate progress if you:

_ Write a remediation plan (in consultation with your committee) detailing the steps you will take to pass your exam and listing firm deadlines for the steps
_ Submit the remediation plan for approval by exam committee
_ Meet the deadlines in your remediation plan

Writing Prospectus

_ Submit first draft of prospectus to advisor before the end of your 4th year in the program
_ Receive approval from dissertation committee on prospectus before end of your 4th year in the program

Dissertating

_ Create a dissertation plan and timeline for completing your dissertation with your advisor within 3 months of completing prospectus
_ Meet the criteria in your dissertation plan

Coursework

Students should work closely with the LRSP co-chairs or other faculty to schedule courses each semester. In most cases, students will need to take any course from the "LRSP Requirements" section when it is offered, because many required courses are only offered every other year. Similarly, students should typically take an even distribution of Section A & B courses each year, unless told otherwise by an advisor or if the student can confirm (through viewing the schedule of upcoming courses in future semesters) that they will have the correct number of courses in each category.

Independent Study Policy

Typically, given the nature of the LRSP curriculum, independent studies are not permitted as part of a student's course work. However, should a student feel that an independent study would benefit their program of study, they must submit a written proposal to the LRSP co-chairs, who will confer with the LRSP faculty to determine whether the proposal will be accepted. The proposal should explain how the independent study or external course will benefit the student's scholarly and career goals. Further, the proposal should explain how the LRSP courses offered that semester (which the student is seeking to substitute) will be of less benefit than the proposed independent study or course. If the student has already taken all the courses offered in a given semester (e.g., due to taking them as an MA student), then the student should simply indicate that.

Registering for Research Hours

Typically, you should focus on registering for a total of 17 credits each academic year. Depending on the circumstances you may be in during any given semester, you may need to register for research hours (in addition to courses) in order to reach 17. See the below sections that illustrate how that might work.

During Coursework

While you are taking coursework, you will likely be taking three courses in the Fall, and two courses in the Spring. Most courses are three credit hours (3 x 3= 9 for the Fall) (3 x 2= 6 in the Spring). In this scenario, you do not need to take research hours in the Fall

semester, but you do need 2 research hours in the Spring in order to bring your total for the year to 17. You should also be teaching one course in the Fall, and two courses in the Spring. If you flip this, and teach 2 in the Fall and 1 in the Spring, your courses will also change, and your research hours are also flipped, meaning you should register for 2 in the Fall.

After Coursework and Before Passing the Qualifying Exam

After you have completed coursework, you will be working on your qualifying exam (typically scheduled in the Fall semester of year 3). For that semester, you should register only for research hours. You determine the number of credit hours you take based on what you are teaching. If you teach one course in the Fall and two courses in the Spring, you need to register for 9 credits of research hours in the Fall, and 8 in the Spring (or vice versa, as described above). If you have an assignment that spans the entire year (such as in the Writing Commons or with the Digital Composition Office), then you still follow the pattern as described above: register for 8 credits in the semester where you are teaching a course, or 9 in the semester where you aren't.

After Passing the Qualifying Exam

After passing the qualifying exam, you should no longer register for research hours. In this case, you will enroll in Dissertation One or Dissertation Two hours.

Qualifying Examinations

Objective of the Qualifying Examination

The examination is designed to give students experience identifying three specific research areas and synthesizing the published scholarship that has been done to date in those areas. These areas should be central to the anticipated dissertation research question, but at the same time, students should understand the issues at stake in each area as a whole, not just as it applies to the dissertation. The process of preparing for the examination helps students move beyond coursework and begin gaining expertise in three scholarly areas. In doing so, students learn to read deeply and broadly across those areas so that they can participate in an informed manner in the ongoing professional research discussions in those areas.

Overview

The Qualifying Examination consists of a series of 3 examinations that are designed to test the candidate's preparation for the dissertation. Therefore, the examinations are not based in the seminar work the candidate has completed but are instead tied more directly to the dissertation project. The examinations are additionally shaped by the candidate's anticipated research and teaching obligations after graduation.

After completing the required course work, the student forms an Examination Committee of three faculty members. This committee shall prepare, administer, and evaluate the qualifying examinations.

The written portion of the Qualifying Examinations shall be administered during a 10-day period scheduled by the student and exam committee during Fall, Spring, or Summer terms. Students will take three 3-hour examinations.

A two hour oral defense of the examinations is completed approximately one week after completion of the written exams. During the oral defense, the dissertation project is also discussed.

The following sections detail the stages of the process.

Assembling the Qualifying Exam Committee

The Qualifying Examination Committee consists of three faculty. During the final semester of coursework, students choose one of the LRSP faculty to serve as their Examination Committee Director (as discussed below, the student and Director will work together to form the committee). It is typical (and best) for Qualifying Examination committee members to continue on and serve as Dissertation Committee member. Students should closely review the responsibilities of the Dissertation Director and the other Dissertation committee members before choosing faculty to serve as Exam committee directors and members.

In short, committee members should be faculty with whom the student has had significant interaction, either through coursework or through one-on-one meetings. Students should select a director who has special expertise in some aspect of their anticipated dissertation project. At the Qualifying Examination stage, the director works with the student to:

- articulate an examination rationale, including a researchable question which will guide the three reading areas
- identify potential reading areas which make sense for the students' project and future goals
- guide the student in forming a committee based on the three reading areas
- schedule examinations and the oral defense

Exam Preparation

1. Once the committee has been formed, the student should begin preparing, in consultation with faculty, a brief description (500 words) of the research project, including the object of study, likely method(s), and anticipated contribution to the field.
2. The student prepares an Examination Rationale and Reading List for each examination in consultation with the faculty member likely to oversee that portion of the examination.
3. The Exam Committee meets with the student and reviews and advises on the examination rationales, reading lists, and target dates for the examination. The student and committee members are likely to meet often individually. When the committee reaches consensus on the rationales and reading lists, the student may schedule the examinations with the Graduate Office. Exams should be scheduled to occur within a 10-day period during Fall, Spring, or Summer term; students

schedule the exams with the Graduate Secretary, who proctors the examinations. Faculty should have examination questions to the Graduate Secretary one week before the examination.

4. Throughout the preparation process, the student is expected to consult with the Exam Committee and individual faculty on the preparation; the student may be asked to prepare sample questions as a preparation strategy. The actual examination questions are not released to the student in advance of the examination.

Exam Procedure

1. On the day of each examination, students report to the Graduate Secretary, who assigns the student to an exam room, provides paper, and distributes and collects the examination. Students will have access to a computer and may only bring the relevant Reading List, and pens or pencils to the examination room. Students are not permitted to bring their own computers, disk or USB drives, or other materials to the exam room.
2. The Graduate Secretary will collect the examination and distribute it to all three members of the Examination Committee, who will assess all of the examinations and meet to discuss the examinations and whether the student may proceed to the Oral Defense. The Examination Committee may decide whether the exams warrant proceeding to the Defense or whether an exam should be rewritten (no examination may be taken more than twice).
3. After the Examination Committee consults, the student is informed of the result. If the Committee decides that the student is ready to move to Oral Defense, that Defense will be scheduled to occur approximately one week after the student's last examination. If the Committee decides that the student is not ready to move to Oral Defense, the student and the Examination Committee Director will meet to discuss what the student must do in order to proceed.

Oral Defense of Exam

1. The Oral Defense is scheduled for two hours; only the student and exam committee are present. During the Oral Defense, the student may have copies of the exams, reading lists, rationales, and project description. The discussion that ensues will be a) of the performance by the student on the individual examinations, b) of questions that arise from those examinations that the student should clarify, and c) of the research project and preparation for the Prospectus. At the end of the Oral Defense, the student will be asked to leave the room while the committee discusses the student's performance.
2. The student is then informed as to the grade of the examination: Pass, Pass with Stipulations, or Fail. "Pass" means that the student is ready to move onto the next stage in her program – preparing the prospectus; "Pass with Stipulation" means that the student must retake one or more of the examinations. "Fail" means the student must retake all three examinations. If the Committee fails the examination, the student and the Examination Committee Director will meet to discuss what the student must do in order to proceed.

3. No Qualifying Examination may be taken more than twice, and students are not permitted to alter any areas covered by the Qualifying Examinations without explicit consent from the faculty.
4. Each member of the Examination Committee then sends an email to the Graduate Secretary indicating that the student has passed that faculty member's exam.
5. Upon successful completion of the Qualifying Examinations, the student then begins work on the Dissertation Prospectus.

Dissertation Procedures

Overview

The following sections describe the course of action students take upon completing their exam. In short, they cover how to:

- assemble the dissertation committee
- write and submit the prospectus for approval
- apply for internal fellowships (that require an approved prospectus for eligibility)
- draft the dissertation
- defend the dissertation

Assembling the Dissertation Committee

After completing exams, it is time to assemble one's dissertation committee, who will guide and approve the dissertation. This committee can, and likely will, include the members of one's exam committee. It will also include other members.

The Dissertation Committee is composed of:

- A Dissertation Director from the LRSP faculty
- Two additional members from the English Department, at least one of them preferably from the LRSP program faculty
- One committee member from outside the Department
- One Graduate Faculty Representative (when the dissertation is nearly complete, the Dissertation Director will arrange for the College to appoint this person)

Further, at least 3 of 4 committee members (excluding the Graduate Faculty Representative) must have F4 Graduate Faculty Status.

Transitioning from the Exam Committee

After the exam, students must decide if their Examination Committee will continue on as their Dissertation Committee. In nearly all cases, this is the preferred choice. After all, part of the purpose of the exam is to prepare students for their dissertation project. The faculty that helped prepare students for the project will be best positioned to help the student see it to completion.

However, the student, preferably working in consultation with the dissertation director, may determine that the dissertation committee would benefit from some changes from the exam committee. If this is the case, the student should communicate clearly and

explicitly with all involved faculty members that the student would like for them to serve, or not, on the dissertation committee.

Choosing the Dissertation Director

The Dissertation Director is the most important person on the student's committee and should be carefully selected. The Dissertation Director normally should be a faculty member who has taught the student in several courses, has expertise in an aspect of the student's dissertation topic and/or approach, and agrees to direct the dissertation.

Students work more closely with their Dissertation Director than they do with committee members. Students can expect the Dissertation Director to take a more formative role than committee members with the student's research design, data collection, analysis, and writing processes. The English Department provides Directors with a one-time one-course release to support the more time-intensive work of directing a student's dissertation project.

Students can expect their Dissertation Director to work with them:

- at the Prospectus stage to design a well grounded, defensible study; to obtain IRB approval (if necessary); and, through the Dissertation Director's detailed response to Dissertation Prospectus drafts, to help students produce a polished version of the Dissertation Prospectus to be distributed to committee members for their feedback.
- at the data collection and analysis stage to provide feedback and guidance through the data collection and to direct students' analyses of their data (helping them to organize their analysis, to provide feedback on findings, and to guide the student in the representation of the findings).
- at the writing stage through their detailed response to chapter drafts, to help students produce a defensible dissertation draft. It is not uncommon for a student to work on multiple drafts of chapters with her Dissertation Director prior to sending these drafts to committee members for feedback. Further, the Dissertation Director will help the student to respond to committee member feedback.

Once selected, the Dissertation Director will work with the student to assemble the rest of the committee.

Committee Responsibilities

Students can expect committee members to work with them:

- at the Prospectus writing stage by providing suggestions on study design, data collection, analytic theories, and other general issues.
- and at the dissertation stage by responding to chapters the student and her Dissertation Director have determined are ready for approval by the committee members. It is not expected that committee members will serve as formative a role on Dissertation Committees nor that they will respond to multiple in-process drafts of dissertation chapters.

Choosing an Outside Reader

Students should work with their Dissertation Director to determine a good candidate for an outside reader. Often Directors have several people in mind.

An outside reader must be a faculty member from outside the Department and discipline.

Typically, the Dissertation Director will make initial contact with the person the student and Director feel will make a good outside reader. After the outside reader agrees to serve on the committee, the student should meet with them to go over their project and solicit any initial feedback on the Prospectus.

Prospectus Preparation

Once students have completed their qualifying exams, they are ready to begin developing the prospectus. The prospectus serves as a "road map" for the dissertation project: it lays out the research questions, relevant literature, and design methods that will drive the student's work. It also serves as a foundational document in the IRB application process (if IRB approval is needed). Finally, the prospectus offers a timeline for finishing the dissertation. Working closely with their Dissertation Director, students will draft and revise the prospectus as needed; when the major theoretical and methodological issues have been worked through, the prospectus is sent to the remaining committee members for review and approval.

The following components should be included in your prospectus. Please note, however, that the prospectus should not read as an outline with separate, unrelated sections. While you may choose to use subheadings to help organize the prospectus, the content of each section should connect, build, and hold together as a cohesive text.

- **Introduction of Problem and Research Question(s)**
  - Define the problem(s) that this work addresses.
  - Articulate how your work proposes to resolve the critical problem(s)
  - State the research question(s) that motivate the study
- **Discussion of the Need / Importance of the Problem**
  - Establish the context for the research question (primarily through a literature review)
  - Establish the extant "positions" on the problem, the importance of the problem to current critical discussions, and the need for work on the problem
  - Describe how the proposed research will contribute to current understandings of and approaches to the problem
- **Discussion of Methodology / Theoretical Approach**
  - Articulate the methods and theoretical approaches with which you will address your research question(s)
  - Describe how the study design appropriately aligns with the research question(s) and is informed by current practices in the field
- **Organization of the Dissertation**

  - Provide a chapter-by-chapter description of the dissertation, offering an overview of the working arguments and structure of the project
- **Timeline for the Completion of the Project**
  - Provide a detailed timeline that articulates your plan for conducting the study, analyzing data, drafting and revising the dissertation, and completing the defense.
- **Notes**
- **Works Cited**
- **Working Bibliography**
  - The working bibliography demonstrates your grasp of the body of research relevant to your project and will necessarily change as your research develops. You may organize it in a variety of ways: by primary and secondary materials, by chapter, etc.

The office of the Graduate Coordinator has sample prospectuses on file. Contact the Graduate Secretary if you would like to review them.

Fellowships

Students who have completed their prospectus are eligible to apply for the two primary fellowships offered by the English Department: the Witte (only LRSP students are eligible) and the Pringle; as well as the University fellowship. Each of these fellowships provides a semester off from teaching during a student's final year in the program. Students should expect to hear from the either the Graduate Coordinator (for the Pringle and University) and the LRSP coordinator (for the Witte) about the deadlines and requirements for applying. Typically, the deadline is the beginning of Spring semester. Application materials typically include a) a letter of application, b) two letters of recommendation from faculty, and c) completed prospectus. Students should endeavor to complete their prospectus and have it signed by late February.

Dissertation

During the dissertation drafting process, students should create a plan in consultation with their Director. In creating the plan, the student and Director should discuss their expectations regarding:

- frequency of face-to-face meetings
- frequency of sharing drafts
- turn-around time for draft feedback

Defense

Distributing the Completed Dissertation

Once the Dissertation Director has approved the entire dissertation (typically after students have responded to feedback on individual chapters from other committee members), students distribute the Dissertation to the committee in either hard copy or electronic form (depending on the wishes of the individual committee members). Students should clearly explain what revisions have been made to any chapters faculty have seen before.

At this time, the Dissertation Director contacts the committee about their availability for Pre-Defense and Dissertation Defense meeting times. After the committee has agreed on a pre-defense date and a tentative Dissertation Defense date, the Dissertation Director applies through the College of Arts and Sciences web site for a Graduate Faculty Representative (the application form requests a time frame for pre defense and defense meetings).

Pre-Defense Committee Meeting

Once the student has distributed a completed draft of the entire dissertation to her committee members, her Director will arrange a Pre-Defense meeting of the committee. The Director will email the entire committee (including outside reader and Graduate Faculty Representative) with suggested dates for the pre-defense and (assuming that meeting goes well) the Defense ten days after the Pre-Defense. The student does not attend this meeting.

The committee must have the dissertation draft at least two weeks prior to the Pre-Defense meeting. At the Pre-Defense meeting, committee members will determine whether the student should:

- move forward to a Dissertation Defense with the dissertation in its current form
- move forward to the Dissertation Defense only after making revisions requested by the committee

At this time, the Dissertation Director will confirm with the committee the previously agree upon tentative Dissertation Defense date. There must be at least ten days between pre-defense meeting and Dissertation Defense. If revisions must be made, committee members will need at least ten days from receipt of the revised Dissertation before the Defense date.

Once the Dissertation Defense has been agreed upon, the student informs the Graduate Secretary, who prepares the necessary paperwork for the Defense and the announcement of the Defense to be distributed in the department.

Dissertation Defense Meeting

Dissertation Defenses are open to the university community and are open to the public.

The Graduate Faculty Representative typically moderates the Defense.

The Dissertation Defense typically begins with the candidate delivering a fifteen minute presentation on her Dissertation research.

After the presentation, committee members will ask the candidate questions related to the dissertation and the candidate's research.

Once the defense is complete, students will be told whether the dissertation has passed or whether additional revisions will need to be made.

The Graduate College maintains a Guidelines for Dissertation Final Examination document that details what may and may not happen in the Defense.

KSU College of Arts and Science Graduate Policies

- Thesis and Dissertation Policies: Guides to Approval of Dissertation Topic and Dissertation Defense.
- Guide to Graduate Education: this guide provides important information regarding KSU policies, such as
  - continuous enrollment: "Graduate students shall enroll for at least one term each year to maintain status as a degree-seeking student. A year is defined as three consecutive terms, including summer as one term. Meeting this minimum enrollment requirement does not guarantee the student will meet the minimum requirements of other programs, offices or agencies"
  - time limits: doctoral students must achieve candidacy (complete qualifying exam) within 5 years. Students must graduate in "10 years from first enrollment for doctoral students entering with a bachelor's degree, nine years from first enrollment for doctoral students entering with a master's degree."
  - grade point average: 3.0 average
- Academic standing: all graduate students are assessed by their graduate program annually. This policy details the possible outcomes of this assessment (e.g., warning or probation).

Graduate Fellowships and Assistantships

To attract and retain highly qualified applicants to our programs, the Department of English has been able to offer fellowships and assistantships that provide students with tuition remission ("waiver"), a nine-month stipend, and a health insurance premium subsidy. In return for funding, the graduate appointee, designated a Teaching Fellow (TF) in a PhD program or a Graduate Assistant (GA) in a master's program, is asked to serve in one of several capacities, most often as an instructor in the Writing Program or for the ESL Center. Students also serve as tutors and administrative assistants in the Writing Commons, Digital Media Lab, or as Fellows to the Wick Poetry Center. The department has periodically been able to extend funding to fellows or assistants to the NEOMFA Coordinator or as research assistants to English Department faculty in the Institute for Bibliography and Editing or for other externally funded projects.

Teaching Fellowships are offered to incoming PhD students for up to four academic years, renewable upon satisfactory performance. Graduate Assistantships, also renewable for satisfactory performance, are awarded to incoming Masters students for up to three years (NEOMFA Program) or up to two years (all other programs). Annually, the department issues a call for unfunded students who wish to apply for a TF or GA, and one or more positions may be offered as one-year (MA or MFA), two-year (MFA or PhD), or three-year (PhD-only) appointments, with tuition waiver and health insurance premium subsidy.

The number and program distribution of assistantships that are offered varies by academic year, but the department generally awards assistantships in the following categories:

- Teaching Fellowships (TFs) are offered to high-ranking PhD applicants to the Literature and Rhet/Comp programs, and they are accompanied by a higher stipend. Students awarded teaching fellowships generally teach one section of

College Writing in fall semester and two section of College Writing in the spring semester.

- Graduate Assistantships (GAs) are offered to high-ranking MA applicants to three programs (Literature, Rhet/Comp, and Creative Writing), and students awarded teaching assistantships generally teach one section of College Writing in fall semester and two sections of College Writing in the spring semester.
- Graduate Assistantships (GAs) are offered to high-ranking MA applicants to the TESL Program, and students awarded assistantships have similar teaching responsibilities, except that the ESL Center courses are offered on a 7-week basis, and duties are divided into two half-terms during each academic semester.
- Teaching Fellowships or Graduate Assistantships (TFs or GAs) in other units—Writing Program Assistant, Wick Poetry Center Fellow, NEO-MFA Coordinator Assistant, Digital Media Lab assistant, research assistant to Institute for Bibliography—are typically awarded competitively to returning students. Duties vary by unit, but responsibilities typically involve assigned tasks, promotion of unit activities, coordination with director, assessment, and weekly meetings. In return for performing duties, TFs or GAs are typically excused from one teaching assignment in an academic term.

The department also has several competitive awards that provide a one-semester release from teaching responsibilities or that extend the term of a prior appointment.

- **Pringle Fellowship:** Named for Kenneth R. Pringle, who began teaching at KSU in 1931 and retired in 1972, two Pringle awards permit a dissertation student a release from teaching responsibility for one semester to focus on the dissertation. Students who apply for the Pringle Fellowship are also forwarded to the university for consideration to the University Fellowship.
- **Witte Fellowship**: Named for Steve Witte, a noted scholar of writing research and rhetoric and the Knight Professor of Rhetoric and Composition at Kent State University, Prof. Witte helped found the LRSP program at Kent State. Two annual Witte awards permit a dissertation student in Rhet/Comp a release from teaching responsibility for one semester to focus on the dissertation.
- **5th-Year Teaching Fellowship:** The department awards a 5th-Year Teaching Fellowship to a student with exceptional teaching and a promising publication record. The award provides a fifth year of funding so that a PhD student can share results at conferences and submit for publication while also teaching two courses per semester in the department.

Applications and Funded Appointments

Incoming students who complete applications by the priority deadline (usually January 15) for admission during the upcoming fall term are automatically considered for funded appointments, typically teaching with the Writing Program. Both incoming and continuing students are ranked by program faculty (Literature, Rhet/Comp, TESL, and NEOMFA), with highly-ranked incoming students receiving offer letters upon admission, waitlisted students (unfunded) being notified about approximate status and likelihood of funding, and currently unfunded students either receiving funding offers or being waitlisted. Program faculty rank admitted or continuing students for funding according to program criteria.

- The Rhetoric and Composition faculty, a committee of the entire faculty, ranks applicants for the following degree programs: PhD in Rhetoric & Composition

and M.A. in Literature and Writing, Rhetoric and Composition Concentration. Students who accept funded offers to the PhD program are designated Teaching Fellows and granted four years of funding. Students who accept funding offers to the MA in Literature and Writing program are designated Graduate Assistants and granted two years of funding. Funding offers renew each year up to initially offered term of funding, based on satisfactory performance.

Conditional Admission

Students who are admitted conditionally, whether with academic conditions or language proficiency conditions, are not eligible for a Teaching Fellowship or Graduate Assistantship. After conditions are satisfied, a student may apply for funding as a returning or continuing student.

Training for Incoming Appointees

Incoming and funded or newly-appointed continuing students are generally required to complete the department's summer training course, ENG-61094, Teaching College Writing, before serving as an instructor in the College Writing Program.

A tuition/fee waiver and additional stipend is provided for the summer III term in which the course is offered.

Students who apply for other types of appointments, in second or later year in program, are trained in new duties as part of the appointment. The teaching appointment for students in the TESL program is not in the College Writing Program but through the ESL Center. TESL students may be required to enroll in summer term for ENG-61094 Teaching College Writing and should inquire through the ESL Center.

Non-Priority Admission and Funding

Students who apply for spring or summer admission are read by and appropriate program committee or the Program Coordinator, but applicants are not considered for funding. Consult web site for deadlines on programs that permit year-round admission. The practice for non-priority admission varies by program.

- The following programs admit, but do not fund, students for spring or summer entry: TESL MA or TESL Cert (applications read by TESL Faculty), MA, Literature and Writing, Literary Traditions or Criticism and Theory Concentration (applications read by Program Coordinator or Graduate Coordinator).
- The following programs do not review applicants for spring or summer admission: Rhet/Comp PhD or MA, Literature and Writing, Rhet/Comp Concentration; NEOMFA. Applications are only read when submitted by priority deadline, January 15, for fall admission. Only applications that are received by the priority deadline are considered for funding.
- The Rhet/Comp program generally does not admit unfunded applicants to the PhD Program or to the MA Program. Students who wish to pursue study part-time or to rely on external funding should contact the Graduate Coordinator at time of application.
- The Graduate Coordinator reads applications to the MA in Teaching year-round, and consults with Program Coordinators for Literature or Rhet/Comp on individual applicants, but MAT applicants are not considered for funding.

Applicants to degree programs that are considered for funding only at the priority deadline may apply for internal funding at the next priority admission term, which is announced on the department LISTSERV. Program faculty rank continuing students alongside incoming students for funding according to program criteria, and newly extended funding for continuing students is announced with a designated term of funding and begins the ensuing fall term (or in summer term, if student is assigned to ENG-61094 Teaching College Writing).

Appointment Term, Academic Leave, and Deferring Admission

The appointment term is 2 academic years in an M.A. programs, 3 academic years in the MFA program, and 4 academic years in a PhD programs. When performance is satisfactory or conditionally satisfactory during annual review, the appointment is automatically renewed up to the initially designated number of terms. Academic appointments are on a series of 9-month academic terms. The department is unable to offer summer funding.

A student who takes approved academic leave in any semester after the first retains the appointment up to the permissible duration of academic leave. No funding is extended during the term of academic leave, but the returning student retains the same number of funded terms as initial funding offer specifies, provided student returns after maximum permissible academic leave.

An admitted student may defer admission, but a student who accepts a TF or GA appointment must begin study during the initially offered admission term. The admission offer remains open for up to an academic year, but the student who defers admission must re-apply for funding.

Annual Review and Reappointment

Each TF/GA appointee has performance reviewed annually, typically in spring for a year-long appointment, in fall if a student has a semester-long appointment. Newly enrolled students have teaching performance reviewed during the first semester of teaching and study. The method of review varies by the type of appointment, but all TF/GA reviews at the individual unit are arranged by the program coordinator or the unit supervisor.

- **Writing Program:** Instructor review is scheduled by the Writing Program Coordinator. All new instructors or TF/GAs will be reviewed during their first semester teaching. Instructors who receive unsatisfactory performance reviews are reviewed again the following semester. Instructors are assigned a observer from the Writing Program, and the instructor schedules the observation and supplies the designated materials (syllabus, lesson plan, etc.). Further details about the reviewing process are part of the *Writing Program Instructors' Manual*. Observation reports are forwarded to the GSC committee for review, in fall and/or spring term.
- **ESL Center:** The ESL Center Director reviews all instructors during the first module of teaching (first 7 weeks), the observation is written up, and a meeting is scheduled with the TF/GA. Observation reports are then forwarded to the GSC committee for review in the spring term.
- **Writing Commons:** The Writing Commons Director reviews performance and communicates orally with a wrap-up near end of semester. The year-end report is then forwarded to the GSC committee for review in the spring term.
- **Wick Poetry:** The Wick Poetry Center Director or staff prepare an annual written evaluation for each GF/TA serving as a fellow. The year-end report is then forwarded to the GSC committee for review in the spring term.

- **Other Appointments**: For other appointments, including NEO MFA program assistantship, Digital Media Lab, or other positions in which one or two students are under the supervision of a faculty member, the program director, coordinator, or faculty supervisor regularly reviews performance and prepares a year-end or semester-end report, as suited to the length of the appointment. The year-end report is then forwarded to the GSC committee for review in the spring term.

The faculty members of GSC reviews performance reports for all students and at committee's discretion chooses one of the following:

- Renew appointment unconditionally for satisfactory performance, up to the term assigned during initial appointment
- Renew appointment conditionally for unsatisfactory performance, requiring additional training and an additional performance review in the subsequent academic term, up to the term assigned during initial appointment
- For second instance of unsatisfactory performance, make recommendation and refer to Department Chair, Graduate Coordinator, and Faculty Advisory Committee's *ad hoc* Grievance Subcommittee.

The GSC reappointment decision is conveyed to the student via email, at or near the close of the academic term.

Students on Appointment: Teaching Performance Expectations

The following items are minimal expectations of any college instructor. For the most part, they involve actions and procedures easily undertaken and can be assessed readily.

Class Punctuality and Office Hours

Instructors are expected to start and end classes punctually and to notify students and department for planned absences beforehand and as soon as practicable for unplanned absences. When concerns unplanned or unscheduled absence from class, notify the Graduate Coordinator and the Department Secretary as soon as practicable.

The general principles for office hours, which apply to graduate students, are the following:

- When teaching one course (3 credit hours) in an in-person and scheduled mode, expected office hours are 3 per week. A minimum of half of those office hours must be scheduled in an on-campus office. The remaining office hours may be virtual or "by appointment."
- When teaching two courses (6 credit hours) in an in-person and scheduled mode, expected office hours are 5 per week. A minimum of half of those office hours must be scheduled in an on-campus office. The remaining office hours may be virtual or "by appointment."
- All further details are elaborations on above basic principles, to allow for asynchronous online classes, ESL module schedules, etc.
    - When teaching an asynchronous all-online course, in-person office hours are not required. Scheduled virtual office hours (phone consultation, Skype, FaceTime, Collaborate, etc.) must offer an equivalent substitute for in-person office hours per week.
    - When teaching one course in an ESL module, TESL instructors should follow guidelines above for one in-person course during that ESL module, 3 office hours per week. Minimum 1.5 hours in person, scheduled.

Remaining 1.5 office hours may be satisfied with "by appointment" or virtual office hours.

- When teaching two courses in an ESL module, TESL instructors should follow guidelines above for two in-person courses during that ESL module. Minimum 2.5 hours in person, scheduled. Remaining 2.5 office hours may be satisfied with "by appointment" or virtual office hours

So long as the general principles are met—the scheduled number of office hours and at least half of them in the mode that matches the class delivery model--any further refinements are at the discretion of the instructor.

Syllabus

For every course taught, a syllabus supplied to students and forwarded to Writing Program or Undergraduate Program, which must include the following. The Provost's office forwards an advisory before each academic semester, which includes recommended wording on several items below.

1. Course number with prefix, title, and section number.
2. Semester and year of this course offering.
3. Instructor name and contact information–phone number, email address, and office hours, with days of the week, hours, and mode of contact.
4. Statement of course objectives and expectations.
5. Statement for courses that fulfill the university requirements – Kent Core, diversity, writing-intensive.
6. Required and optional textbooks and materials.
7. Course prerequisites, including a statement that students in the course who do not have the proper prerequisites risk being deregistered from the class.
8. Statement on enrollment/official registration.
9. General class calendar indicating the lecture topics, including important dates and deadlines for assignments, tests and/or projects.
10. The course withdrawal deadline. See http://www.registrars.kent.edu/home/CLASSES/sessdatesrch.cfm
11. Clear statement of grading policy and grade distribution/percentages for all class requirements.
12. Statement concerning cheating and plagiarism.
13. Statement regarding accessibility and registering for accommodations for a documented disability.

Policies about Assignments

- Reasonable notification of assignments, examinations, and changes in syllabus.
- Provision of reasonable make-up procedures for legitimately missed exams or other graded work.
- Evaluation of work with adequate and constructive comments written on students' papers or orally, as is appropriate to the character of the test or assignment.
- Evaluation of work within a reasonable timeframe that allows the student to benefit from the instructor's comments prior to the next assignment.

Basic Pedagogy

Although the intellectual and judgmental skills essential for acceptable teaching are more open to interpretation than class management techniques, the following items are presented as constructive suggestions for the improvement of teaching.

- Content, assignments, and approach should be keyed to the level, aims, and nature of the course.
- Methods of communication and teaching techniques should be appropriate to the level of students and the subject matter and delivery method for the course.
- Each class session should reflect thorough preparation, including knowledge of and currency in the subject matter. For instructors in College Writing I and II, ENG-61094 Teaching College Writing provides the requisite training. The TESL program provides training for ESL Center courses.
- Testing and grading practices should relate directly to course content and assignments.

Students on Appointment: Non-Teaching Performance Expectations

Appointments that may not require teaching duties include Writing Commons, Writing Program Assistant, ESL Center Assistant, Digital Media Lab, and Wick Poetry Fellow. Duties vary by unit, but responsibilities typically involve assigned tasks by the unit director, promotion of unit activities, coordination with director, assessment, and weekly meetings. Renewal of a non-teaching appointment is usually at the discretion of the unit director, and students in non-teaching appointments are assigned annual performance reviews.

Unsatisfactory Performance and Termination

The department recognizes a distinction between unsatisfactory performance, which can be addressed by training and counseling, and actions so destructive that they merit immediate suspension and termination.

Criteria for Unsatisfactory Performance

The Graduate Coordinator, on the basis of performance reviews and in consultation with the Faculty Advisory Committee's *ad hoc* Grievance Subcommittee determine what the appropriate departmental response shall be, such as mentoring or additional training, for instances of the following:

1. Lack of academic progress in the graduate appointee's studies,
2. Unsatisfactory performance of assigned teaching duties, as determined during performance review.
3. In a non-teaching assistantship, the failure to perform duties, such as because of absence or neglect of responsibilities, or similar actions that undermine the

ability of the unit to serve its clientele--as determined during performance review.

Criteria for Immediate Termination of Appointment

The Chair, on the basis of compelling evidence and in consultation with the Graduate Studies Coordinator and the Faculty Advisory Committee, may terminate a graduate appointment for the following reasons:

- Academic dishonesty, examples of which include claiming credit for the work of another without authorization or citation (plagiarism in a graduate course) or falsely representing a student's academic performance, based on criteria unrelated to classroom expectations and syllabus guidelines, examples of which include falsely reported exam scores or paper grades.
- Failure to perform assigned duties, to a degree that shows willful intent to disregard assigned duties, examples of which include not holding class at regularly scheduled time and place, not holding office hours, not supplying a syllabus. In a non-teaching assistantship, examples include series of absences at assigned work time or other refusal to perform duties like attending meetings, etc.
- Threatening students, or endangering students, examples of which include scheduling unauthorized field trips or holding class or other educational activity (e.g., tutoring session) in an unauthorized off-campus location, without the knowledge and prior request and permission of the Program Coordinator or Graduate Coordinator.
- Writing or uttering comments so inappropriate, disparaging, harassing, or abusive that they create a hostile learning environment and/or deter students from attending class meetings or other educational activities, examples of which include those defined by the Policy Register (https://www.kent.edu/policyreg) under University Policy Regarding Unlawful Discrimination and Harassment.

Appointment Termination and Appeals Policy and Procedure

A decision about suspending a student from graduate appointee duties or termination belongs to the Department Chair in consultation with the Graduate Coordinator. A suspension of duties, on well-founded evidence that it meets above criteria for immediate termination or repeated unsatisfactory performance, may be taken immediately, but the recommendation for appointment termination must be reviewed by the Faculty Advisory Committee's (FAC) *ad hoc* Grievance Subcommittee before it will take effect. The Department Chair, the Graduate Coordinator, and the Grievance Subcommittee must provide to the TF/GA appointee written statements explaining the justification for termination. The student may contest or appeal the decision to the Graduate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Suspension

The decision to suspend a student from performing duties as a Graduate Assistant or Teaching Fellow is entirely at the discretion of the Department Chair, in consultation with the Graduate Coordinator. A notice about intent to terminate should be filed within three weeks of a suspension. If a termination recommendation is not submitted to or is not approved by the FAC *ad hoc* Grievance Subcommittee, the Grievance Subcommittee should make a recommendation about when to end the suspension.

Immediate Termination

The Department Chair, in consultation with the Graduate Studies Coordinator, may suspend immediately from duties a graduate appointee whose performance is designated to meet the criteria for immediate termination. The decision is referred to the Faculty Advisory Committee's

(FAC) *ad hoc* Grievance Subcommittee for review. If the Grievance Subcommittee affirms the recommendation of the Department Chair and the Graduate Studies Coordinator, the suspension will remain in force and the appointment will be terminated at end of the semester. If the Grievance Subcommittee does not affirm the recommendation of the Department Chair and the Graduate Studies Coordinator, the decision about whether to terminate the student's appointment remains with the Department Chair, in consultation with the Graduate Coordinator.

Unsatisfactory Performance Termination

A graduate appointee whose performance is designated unsatisfactory in one semester will be offered mentoring services by the relevant Program Coordinator, which may consist of review of teaching materials or recommended training. When additional training or materials review is complete, the completion must be reported back to the Graduate Coordinator.

The appointee shall be reviewed again the following academic term, and a repeated instances of unsatisfactory performance shall be referred to the Faculty Advisory Committee's (FAC) *ad hoc* Grievance Subcommittee, which reviews in consultation with the Department Chair and the Graduate Studies Coordinator, to decide whether to terminate the student appointment. At the discretion of the Department Chair, in consultation with the Graduate Studies Coordinator, the student's appointment-related duties after second unsatisfactory performance review may be suspended immediately, at the conclusion of review by the Grievance Subcommittee, or by the end of current semester or before next semester appointment begins.

Appealing Termination

A student whose appointment is terminated immediately or whose performance is terminated for receiving unsatisfactory performance reviews, and whose termination has been reviewed by the Faculty Advisory Committee's (FAC) *ad hoc* Grievance Subcommittee, whether decision is affirmed or not, may contest or appeal the termination decision to the Graduate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Other Termination-Related Policies

A graduate student whose appointment is terminated, whether immediately or for repeated unsatisfactory performance, shall continue to be funded through the end of the semester, with health insurance intact, during which the termination was effected.

A graduate student whose appointment is terminated, whether immediately or for unsatisfactory performance, shall be ineligible to hold another appointment in the department, including employment as a temporary instructor.

Teaching and Administrative Opportunities

Teaching

First Year Composition Sequence

Professional writing courses

Writing Program Administration

There are many projects that the Writing Program researches, develops, implements, and revises throughout the year, most of which are related to first-year writing. Writing Program Graduate Assistants (WPGAs) work directly with the Writing Program

Coordinator (Dr. Jen Cunningham) and take part in mentoring new graduate students on teaching appointment and updating and maintaining the Student Guide to College Writing I & II website. Other duties are divided among the WPGAs depending on their interests and can include any the following: updating the Writing Placement Reassessment writing prompt, reading Zurava portfolios, creating various research and/or assessment projects for the betterment of writing students and learning, writing grants related to first-year composition, organizing and implementing the recognition of outstanding students and faculty, and networking to other departments on campus.

Writing Program Internship

The Writing Internship Program (WIP) is an opportunity for juniors and seniors to get a semester's worth of experience (and upper-level course credits) working in a writing-intensive position on campus or in the local community, to network with professionals, and to put together an impressive portfolio to help them land a career. The WIP assistant director graduate assistantship is a two-year appointment, during which the assistant's three primary responsibilities include:

- helping the current group of interns to thrive at their internship sites
- giving them guidance for their future careers
- promoting the WIP to recruit a new talented group for the next semester.

The assistant director helps the director (Uma Krishnan) coordinate with site supervisors (and should be on the lookout for viable new internship sites to add to the WIP's rolodex), and, following an application and interview process, sets up approved applicants with internship sites that suit their career aspirations and writing abilities. During the semester, the assistant director checks in with the interns periodically to make sure things are going smoothly, reads bi-monthly internship memos and any writing the interns produce, and assists in once-monthly internship meetings where everyone gets together and talks about how things are going. Toward the end of each semester, the assistant director promotes the WIP by giving talks to pre-requisite classes and attending promotional events in the department and around campus. When the applications come in, the assistant helps arrange interviews and helps make decisions about who to give the internships to and where they seem best suited to work. And it all starts over again the following semester.

Assistant to the Coordinator of the Office of Digital Composing.

The AC works with the coordinator (Dr. Van Ittersum) to address the practical and pedagogical needs of teachers using the laptop classrooms and to create structures which encourage innovative and creative teaching with technology. This position involves a one year commitment with the possibility of renewal at the end of the year.

The AC's work is predominantly pedagogical. The AC helps faculty and students teach and research composing in a digital environment. Major responsibilities include working with the Coordinator on: planning and conducting orientation meetings at the beginning of the semester, designing and leading workshops each semester on digital composing issues for teaching staff, designing and posting tutorials and other materials on the office's website, working one-on-one with current teaching staff on teaching

issues, and creating structures which encourage innovative and creative teaching with technology.

Writing Commons Assistant Coordinator

There are two assistant director (AD) positions, and both are two-year appointments. The ADs work with the Director of the Writing Commons (Jeanne Smith) on various tutor-training and professional development programs throughout each semester. The ADs are also responsible for constructing and following the curriculum and guidelines of the Commons, and arranging weekly meetings with senior tutoring staff to insure their implementation. They help select, train, and occasionally discipline the tutors; in order to promote morale, they help lead various committees and workshops based on tutors' professional interests and needs. They also run the Commons whenever the Director is unavailable, including during the summer; otherwise, a minimum of seven office hours are required. Like the Director, they are encouraged to also have tutoring appointments with students, although this is not a requirement of the position.

Resources

LRSP

LRSPers listserv
You should be added to this upon entering the program. If you do not receive emails from the list, please get in touch with the LRSP co-chairs.

Departmental

Placement workshops are organized by the Graduate Studies Coordinator to assist you in all facets of preparing to enter the job market and obtain employment. Workshops will focus on the vitae, cover letter, teaching philosophy and portfolio, and interviewing skills. Dates and times of the Placement Workshops will be announced on the Graduate Student listserv.

College

Conference funding is available for graduate students who are presenting a paper at a conference. You may request the form which is required to apply at the front desk in the English Department.

LRSP Dissertations & Placement

2021

Sommer Sterud, Henry Ford College
Tracing Framing Processes in the Abortion Debate: An Ethnographic Investigation of a Pro-Life Lobbying Organization
Director: Derek Van Ittersum

Mary Le Rouge, Cleveland Institute of Music
How Literate Responses to Technical Communication Can Promote Practical Responses to Environmental Change
Director: Pamela Takayoshi

William Morris, Kent State University
A Rhetorical Approach to Examining Writing Assessment Validity Claims
Director: Brian Huot

Shannon McKeehen, Tiffin University
Engaging Peer Response in First-year Composition: Writers, Readers, and Rapport
Director: Brian Huot

2020

Amy Flick, University of Pittsburgh
ReDefining Risk: An Examination of Harm Reduction Discourse and Language
Director: Pamela Takayoshi

Sarah Lawrence
A Rhetoric of Self-Injury: Establishing Identity and Representing the Body in Online Self-Injury Forums
Director: Sara Newman

Aubrey Crosby, Penn State University
News Media Representation of The Dakota Access Pipeline Protest (A Study Using Systemic Functional Linguistics)
Director: Patricia Dunmire

Lauren Matus, Sinclair Community College
Judging Knowledge: Conceptions of Literacy at UNESCO during the United Nations Literacy Decade 2003-2012
Director: Sara Newman

Jamie Peterson
Who says what and why it matters: an analysis of the verbal and written communication regarding classroom writing assessments
Director: Brian Huot

Yvonne Lee, Lehigh University
Writing Toward Expert: The Writing Center's Role in the Development of Graduate Writers
Director: Pamela Takayoshi

Jason Sharier
"Conceptualizing Composition: How College-writers (and Instructors) Use Figurative Thinking to Conceptualize, Acquire, and Enact Literacy
Director: Sara Newman

Christina Rowell
Capturing the Dynamic Whole: Multimodal Composing Processes of Fashion Design Students
Director: Derek Van Ittersum

2019

Julie Saternus, Cleveland State University
Multilingual Literacy Practice in One School Community: Reading, Writing, and Being Across Japanese and English
Director: Derek Van Ittersum

Christine Olding, Trine University
Composing Processes of Musicians: A Case Study Approach
Director: Pamela Takayoshi

2018

Barbara Petronelli
To Secure Literary Culture and Promote a Social Feeling": Rural Ohio Clubwomen as Stewards of Local Literacy Practice
Director: Pamela Takayoshi

Megan Brenneman, Technical Writer
Composing the Past through the Multiliteracies at the May 4 Visitors Center
Director: Pamela Takayoshi

Barbara George, Kent State at Salem
Literate Practices: Public Deliberations about Energy and Environmental Risks
Director: Pamela Takayoshi

2016

Alexis Baker, Kent State University at Stark
Identity and Resistance: Understanding Representations of Ethos and Self in Women's Holocaust Texts
Director: Sara Newman

Curt Greve, Grand Valley State University
Reading Beyond the Folder: Classroom Portfolio Assessment as a Literacy Event
Director: Brian Huot

2015

Uma Krishnan, Kent State University
A Cross-Cultural Study of the Literacy Practices of the Dabbawalas: Towards a New Understanding of Nonmainstream Literacy and Its Impact on Successful Business Practices (honorable mention for James Berlin Outstanding Dissertation Award in 2016)
Director: Brian Huot

Chris McCracken, University of Wisconsin, LaCrosse
Mess Management in Microbial Ecology: Rhetorical Processes of Disciplinary Integration
Director: Derek Van Ittersum

Jessica Corey, Duke University
Literate Artifacts and Psychosocial Compositions: Feminist Activism's Composing, Archiving, and Revising of Social Narratives Director: Pamela Takayoshi

Dayna Goldstein, Texas A&M University Texarkana
A MacDonald's Sentence Style Disciplinary Analysis of Honors Theses in Three Genres
Director: Ray Craig

Kathryn Byrne, Johnson County Community College
The Give and Take of Peer Review: Utilizing Modeling and Imitation
Director: Sara Newman

2014

Yvonne Teems, Grant Street Group
The Discursive Construction of Identity and the Body by Members of a Senior Center Yoga Class
Director: Pamela Takayoshi

Phillip Sloan, Oakton Community College
Assembling the Identity of 'Writer.'
Director: Sara Newman

Lea Povozhaev, Qualtek Electronics
Addiction Rhetoric: Conceptual Metaphors in Conversational Illness Narratives
Director: Sara Newman

2013

Lindsay Steiner, University of Wisconsin LaCrosse
The Available Means of Design: A Rhetorical Investigation of Professional Multimodal Composing
Director: Pamela Takayoshi

Barbara Karman, Kent State University
19th Century Women and Humor: The Emergence of Feminist Humor
Director: Sara Newman

2012

Courtney Werner, Monmouth College
Disciplining New Media: Rhetoric and Composition's Disciplinary Development through the Case of New Media 2000-2010
Director: Pamela Takayoshi

Nicole Caswell, Eastern Carolina University
Reconstructing Emotion: Understanding the Relationship between Teachers' Emotions and Teachers' Response Practices
Director: Brian Huot

Holly Wells, East Stroudsburg University
Picture a Scientist: A Visual Rhetoric Approach to the Problem of Gender Disparity in STEM Fields
Director: Sara Newman

Jennifer Cunningham, Kent State University
"jus showin sum luv 2 yo page!": The Features, Functions, and Implications of Digital African American Language
Director: Brian Huot

Diana Awad Scrocco, Youngstown State University
An Examination of the Literate Practices of Resident Physicians and Attending Physician Preceptors in a Residential-Run Internal Medicine Clinic
Director: Sara Newman

Jill Hawkins
Sounds Write: Embracing Multimodal Texts as Literate Composition
Director: Pamela Takayoshi

Melissa Selby, Georgia Gwinnett College
Expanding the Definition of Multimodality: Identifying Key Processes in Students' Designing.
Director: Ray Craig

2011

Sigrid Streit, University of Detroit Mercy
Gesture and Rhetorical Delivery: The Transmission of Knowledge in Complex Situations.
Director: Sara Newman

John Oddo, Carnegie Mellon University
Traversing the 24-Hour News Cycle: A Busy Day in the Rhetorical Life of a Political Speech.
Director: Christina Haas

Patrick Thomas, University of Dayton
A Discourse-Based Analysis of Literacy Sponsorship in New Media: The Case of Military Blogs.
Director: Pamela Takayoshi

Elizabeth Tomlinson, West Virginia University
Conceptualizing Audience in Digital Invention.
Director: Sara Newman

Jillian Hill, University of Houston
Collaborative writing activities at Midwest Utility.
Director: Ray Craig

Yuri Maziev
A Critique Of Vygotskian Scholarship In Writing And Literacy Studies: The Role Of Marxist Dialectics In The Discussions Of Method
Director: Ray Craig

2010

Emily Wierszewski, Seton Hill University
A Readerly Eye: Teachers Reading Student Multimodal Texts.
Director: Ray Craig

Dirk Remley, Kent State University
This Community's Literacy has been Sponsored by….: An Historical Case Study of the Literate Impact of the Boomtown Arsenal on the Community of Fieldview, Ohio from 1940-1960.
Director: Brian Huot

2009

Lewis Caccia, Jr., Walsh University
Risk Communication in the Workplace: An Analysis of Communications Toolkits as

Rhetoric Practice.
Director: Sara Newman

Christa Teston, The Ohio State University
Deliberative Decision-Making in One Medical Workplace Setting.
Director: Christina Haas

Chad Wickman, Auburn University
Displays of Knowledge: Text Production and Medial Reproduction in Scientific Practice.
Director: Christina Haas

2008

Jeffrey Perry, Indiana University Southeast
Institutional Cunning: Writing Assessment as Social Reproduction.
Director: Brian Huot

2007

David Overbey, Bellarmine University
Verifying Web-Based Information: Investigating Professional Communicator's Online.
Director: Christina Haas

2006

Kenneth Marunowski
The Euro: An Ethnography of Inscription and Incorporation.
Director: Christina Haas

Kathryn Weiss, Salem Community College
Reconceiving Material Rhetoric: Literacy Beyond Language at Kent State's May 4 Memorial.
Director: John Ackerman

2004

Hunter Stephenson, University of Houston Clear Lake
Kairos, Production, and Writing.
Director: Stephen P. Witte

2003

Kerrie Farkas, Millersville University
Deliberative Rhetoric in the Civic Arena: A Taxonomy of Discourse in a Local City Government.
Director: Christina Haas

Contact Information

Kent State University
College of Arts and Sciences Bowman Hall
Kent, OH 44242
330-672-2062
Graduate Programs Web site (forms and other information)

Kent State University
Department of English 113 Satterfield Hall
Kent, OH 44242
330–672-2676

English Department
Graduate Studies Coordinator
Satterfield Hall 113B
330-672-1748
Graduate Secretary Lauren Gougler Satterfield Hall 113C lgougler@kent.edu
330-672-1708

LRSP Kent State homepage
LRSP Facebook page