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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 ............................................................................................................................................... 4
MA Checklist .......................................................................................................................................................... 4
  General Requirements ........................................................................................................................................ 4
  Rhetoric & Composition Concentration Requirements .................................................................................. 4
  33 Total Hours Required for MA ..................................................................................................................... 5
PhD Checklist .................................................................................................................................................... 6
  I. Prerequisites (typically satisfied with MA Work) ....................................................................................... 6
  II. LRSP Requirements (12 hours) .................................................................................................................. 6
  III. LRSP Section A: Theory (9 hours) ........................................................................................................... 6
  IV. LRSP Section B. Practice (9 hours) .......................................................................................................... 6
  V. Other relevant coursework .......................................................................................................................... 6
PhD Four-Year Plan ............................................................................................................................................. 7
Academic Standing Policy .................................................................................................................................. 8
  Coursework ....................................................................................................................................................... 8
  Preparing for Exams ....................................................................................................................................... 8
  Writing Prospectus .......................................................................................................................................... 9
  Dissertating ..................................................................................................................................................... 9
Coursework ........................................................................................................................................................ 9
  Independent Study Policy ............................................................................................................................... 9
Qualifying Examinations .................................................................................................................................... 9
  Objective of the Qualifying Examination ...................................................................................................... 9
  Overview ......................................................................................................................................................... 10
  Assembling the Qualifying Exam Committee .............................................................................................. 10
  Exam Preparation .......................................................................................................................................... 11
  Exam Procedure .............................................................................................................................................. 11
  Oral Defense of Exam .................................................................................................................................. 11
Dissertation Procedures ..................................................................................................................................... 12
  Overview ......................................................................................................................................................... 12
  Assembling the Dissertation Committee .................................................................................................... 12
    Transitioning from the Exam Committee ................................................................................................ 13
    Choosing the Dissertation Director .......................................................................................................... 13
    Committee Responsibilities ......................................................................................................................... 14
    Choosing an Outside Reader ...................................................................................................................... 14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prospectus Preparation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowships</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributing the Completed Dissertation</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Defense Committee Meeting</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation Defense Meeting</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU College of Arts and Science Graduate Policies</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Administrative Opportunities</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Program Administration</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Program Internship</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant to the Coordinator of the Office of Digital Composing.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Commons Assistant Coordinator</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRSP</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRSP Faculty</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRSP Dissertations &amp; Placement</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Information</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Curriculum Checklists

MA Checklist

General Requirements

Introductory Courses (6 hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Semester Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61000 Introduction to Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61094 Introduction to Research in the Teaching of College Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>61094 required only for students on appointment</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area Requirements (12 hours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Semester Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Division I Rhetoric &amp; Composition (3 Hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division II Literary Traditions (6 Hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III Critical Studies &amp; Theory (3 Hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Division II or Division III students cannot use: English 6/75031</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division III Critical Studies &amp; Theory (3 Hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Division II or Division III students cannot use: English 6/75031</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Semester Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Exam or Course</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rhetoric & Composition Concentration Requirements

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Semester Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65012 Reading and Interpreting Research on Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Semester Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65022: Rhetorical Theory: Greek &amp; Roman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65023: Rhetorical Theory: 18th-20th C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65027: Role of Composition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65035: Linguistics for Rhetoricians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
65051: Literacy: Function, Practices, & History
65052: Writing Activity As Social Practice
65053: Writing Technologies

C. Open Elective (3 hours, graduate level)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Semester Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional 3 hour Elective if 61094 was not required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 Total Hours Required for MA
PhD Checklist

**I. Prerequisites (typically satisfied with MA Work)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Semester Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61094: Introduction to Research in the Teaching of College Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3 credit hours)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**II. LRSP Requirements (12 hours)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Semester Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75012: Reading &amp; Interpreting Research on Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75051: Literacy: Functions, Practices and History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79022: Greek &amp; Roman Rhetorical Theory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75044: Research Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III. LRSP Section A: Theory (9 hours)**

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

**IV. LRSP Section B. Practice (9 hours)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Semester Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85041: Field Research Methods in Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85042: Discourse Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75052: Writing Activity as Social Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75053: Writing Technologies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85054: Studies in Literacy and Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85057: Rhetorical Methods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**V. Other relevant coursework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Semester Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By choice or as a result of completing the MA in R/C at KSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity / Benchmarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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  
• 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.

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 LRSP 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 LRSP 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 LRSP faculty members
• 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. Completing and filing the prospectus is the final benchmark to achieving candidacy status.

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.

**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. A single application applies to all. Students should expect to hear from the Graduate Coordinator about the deadlines and requirements for applying. Typically, the deadline is the beginning of March. Students should endeavor to complete their prospectus and have it signed before then.

**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**

- **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 (submit prospectus) 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).

**Teaching and Administrative Opportunities**

**Teaching**

- **First Year Composition Sequence**
- **Professional writing courses**

**Writing Program Administration**

There are approximately nine different projects that the Writing Program researches, develops, implements, and revises throughout the year. Some of which each Graduate Assistant takes part in—such as mentoring new Teaching Assistants—others are divided amongst the assistants depending on their interests. However, assistants are never discouraged from learning or working on as many as desired: updating the Challenge writing prompt and readings, Zurava portfolio readings, updating and maintaining the Writing Program website, various research projects for the betterment of writing
students and learning, assessment projects, grant writing and obtainment, organizing and implementing the recognition of outstanding students and faculty, as well as 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 Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Dunmire</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pdunmire@kent.edu">pdunmire@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Huot</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bhuot@kent.edu">bhuot@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Newman</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:snewman@kent.edu">snewman@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamela Takayoshi</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ptakayos@kent.edu">ptakayos@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Van Ittersum</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dvanitte@kent.edu">dvanitte@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LRSP Dissertations & Placement

2016

Alexis Baker, Anne Arundel Community College
*Identity and Resistance: Understanding Representations of Ethos and Self in Women’s Holocaust Texts*
Director: Sara Newman

Curt Greve Reading Beyond the Folder: Classroom Portfolio Assessment as a Literacy Event
Director: Brian Huot

2015

Uma Krishnan, Kent State University
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, Syracuse University
*Literate Artifacts and Psychosocial Compositions: Feminist Activism’s Composing, Archiving, and Revising of Social Narratives* Director: Pamela Takayoshi

Dayna Goldstein
*A MacDonald’s Sentence Style Disciplinary Analysis of Honors Theses in Three Genres*
Director: Ray Craig

Kathryn Byrne
*The Give and Take of Peer Review: Utilizing Modeling and Imitation*
Director: Sara Newman

2014

Yvonne Teems Stephens, Hofstra University
*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, Lakeland Community College
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, Hope 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, Stark
“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, Stark State University
Expanding the Definition of Multimodality: Identifying Key Processes in Students’ Designing.
Director: Ray Craig
2011

**Sigrid Streit, Pennsylvania State University**  
*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 Inscripton 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 Website (forms and other information)

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

LRSP Co-Chairs 2017-18  
Derek Van Ittersum  
Pamela Takayoshi

English Department  
Graduate Studies Coordinator  
Wesley Raabe  
Satterfield Hall 113B  
wraabe@kent.edu  
330-672-1748

LRSP Kent State homepage  
LRSP Facebook page

Graduate Secretary  
Lauren Gougler  
Satterfield Hall 113C  
lgougler@kent.edu  
330-672-1708