Situated University, Situated Writing

Ann M. Feldman

Dr. Feldman was recognized with a "Citation for Distinguished Engaged Scholarship" in the 2008 competition for the Ernest A. Lynton Award for Faculty Professional Service and Academic Outreach. The Lynton Award program is managed by the New England Resource Center for Higher Education (NERCHE) based at University of Massachusetts at Boston, and the awards are presented at the Annual Conference of the Coalition of Urban and Metropolitan Universities.

Abstract

This article argues that teaching writing as a situated, civic activity must be a core intellectual activity in the engaged metropolitan university. Situated writing provides the key pedagogy for the Chicago Civic Leadership Certificate Program at the University of Illinois at Chicago, an engaged public research university. The role of writing, or discourse, is emphasized as a link between engaged faculty research and student civic engagement.

As metropolitan universities take up the call for engagement, our traditional notions of teaching, research, and service change (Feldman 2008; Henningsen n.d.). But often ignored is one feature of this change: the role that discourse, or writing, plays in the making of knowledge in an engaged university. For scholars who conduct engaged research, writing is a crucially important, yet frequently unremarked, tool. For students, the engaged university offers a unique opportunity to become better writers and, equally important, civically-engaged writers.

When I speak of students becoming "better" writers, I invoke a much broader definition than is usually attached to academic writing. A better writer is a situated writer, motivated by the particular context in which a piece of writing is imagined, designed, executed, delivered, and provokes consequences. Writing, then, is taken to be a performance that emerges from and potentially can transform a specific situation. Such performances take place in the classroom, to be sure, but now, given impetus by the engaged university, writing also is performed in the community.

In this article, I will argue that teaching writing as a situated, civic activity—rather than as a way solely to demonstrate learning—must be a core intellectual activity in the engaged metropolitan university. This argument is built on my experience with a very talented team of undergraduate students, graduate students, staff, faculty, and administrators who together built the Chicago Civic Leadership Certificate Program (CCLCP; www.uic.edu/depts/oaa/CCLCP/) at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC). After describing our two-year, community-based learning program, I'll define

more precisely what I mean by situated writing. In addition, I'll discuss how situated writing differs from traditional conceptions of writing based on notions of reflection. To further contextualize our program, I will describe our particular approach to engagement at UIC which has, until recently, focused almost exclusively on faculty research and scholarship as a means for improving life in Chicago and other great cities. Finally, I will emphasize the role of discourse in engaged faculty research and illustrate how situated faculty writing can create a rich context for undergraduate civic engagement.

Focus on Writing: The Chicago Civic Leadership Certificate Program (CCLCP)

CCLCP students take four engaged learning courses during their first two years of college. In each course, substantial mentoring by community partners guides students through meaningful and consequential projects needed by the nonprofit organizations the partners represent. CCLCP's focus is on writing, rhetoric, and research, and CCLCP students learn, as they move from the classroom to the community and back again, how these core academic skills drive social change (Feldman et al. 2006). Our program's unique approach helps UIC form articulate, civically engaged graduates who know how to pursue their goals with creativity and passion. CCLCP students learn to mesh their chosen majors and, eventually, their careers with their participation in building vibrant communities.

Let me share with you some of the details of this program and describe a couple of projects completed by our students. CCLCP selects students as incoming freshmen. High-school seniors who have been admitted to UIC learn about CCLCP from postal and electronic mailings soliciting applications for the program. Successful applicants are selected not on the basis of their ACT scores or writing skill, but for their interest—a "spark" we call it—in exploring and addressing major social and civic issues and for their willingness to work collaboratively. Over their first two years at UIC, our students take one CCLCP course each semester, earning four credit hours for each: the three credits normally attached to the course and an additional "field research" credit that recognizes the thirty hours each student spends each semester working on-site with his or her community partner organization on projects needed by the organization.

Both first-year courses are writing courses required of all UIC students. During their second year, CCLCP students take a specially designed version of a non-English Department General Education course such as Community Psychology or The Sociology of Youth. In the fourth and final CCLCP course, English 375: Rhetoric and Public Life, students independently initiate community partnerships and complete projects they design with and for their partners. They also compile portfolios of their CCLCP work and produce résumés and cover letters aimed at securing internships. After completing all four courses and receiving their Chicago Civic Leadership Certificates, which will be noted on their university transcripts, students may return to CCLCP as juniors and seniors to take part in our community-based, for-credit internship program.

In CCLCP, the quality, extent, and depth of student learning depends on the mentorship of community partners, and we know from experience that partnerships aren't born: they are made. We recruit a diverse range of nonprofit partner organizations to satisfy our students' various interests. During fall semester 2008, CCLCP students partnered with twenty-four different organizations: BUILD (Broader Urban Involvement and Leadership Development), Center on Halsted, Changing Worlds, Chicago Youth Centers, Chinese-American Service League, Community School Health Initiatives, Cooperative Image Group, Erie Neighborhood House, Forest Preserve District of Cook County, Gads Hill Center, Greater Chicago Food Depository, Insight Arts, Inspiration Corporation, Jane Addams Hull-House Museum, Latino Education Alliance, Enlacé (formerly Little Village Community Development Corporation), Mujeres Latinas En Acción, North Lawndale Community News, Organic School Project, Pilsen Alliance, Pui Tak Center, The Resurrection Project, UIC Honors College, and World Relief Corporation.

We look for partners whose missions address urban challenges or who offer programs intended to improve the quality of urban life. We value continuing partnerships while each year initiating new partnerships through a Request for Proposal (RFP) that explains not only the nature of CCLCP, but also the benefits and responsibilities of a CCLCP partnership. Because we differ very significantly from more familiar volunteer and/or internship programs, the RFP is the crucial first step in acquainting new partners with the structural and philosophical features of CCLCP. The document emphasizes the program's dual interest in academics and community engagement by encouraging potential partners to "identify student projects that serve both learning goals and our partners' missions." Organizations accepted into partnerships are invited to a mid-summer orientation and project-planning event that launches both our new and continuing partnerships for the school year ahead. For each partner, we develop a memorandum of understanding that officially acknowledges that partners serve as mentors for our students and sets out the terms of the five hundred dollars per-student, per-semester stipend to be paid to each partner to acknowledge its contribution to our students' CCLCP education.

Two exemplary CCLCP student projects illustrate how writing and research become situated activities carried out with a sense of consequence for the organization's circumstances and needs. Partnering with North Lawndale Community News, in the eponymous, largely African American, West Side community, several of our students researched the business community in the commercial area around the busy intersection of Roosevelt Road and Western Avenue. Working from an outdated business directory, they determined which businesses still existed and which had closed. They then hit the streets to identify businesses that had moved into the area since the old directory was published. They not only gathered factual data on each business, but also gathered information from owners and operators about the challenges of running a business in North Lawndale. When the students analyzed the data they had collected, they discovered that competition from corporate businesses (such as McDonald's, KFC, etc.) and the gentrification of some nearby housing presented tremendous challenges to "mom and pop" operations. The students used

their research and analysis as the basis for a written proposal for funding a new directory of local businesses. The directory is envisioned as a way to support small businesses in the area by raising their profile.

Just southwest of UIC in a predominately Latino neighborhood, two CCLCP students worked with Pilsen Alliance to develop outreach strategies for involving community residents, many of whom are unfamiliar with and intimidated by governmental and political processes, in various local initiatives sponsored by Pilsen Alliance, including an upcoming Community Congress. The students worked from the assumption that Pilsen Alliance can't be effective if it works for Pilsen residents, but can be very effective if it works with them. They discovered that many residents, especially older ones, didn't believe that their voices could possibly matter to people in power positions in Chicago. The students, therefore, focused further research efforts on outreach strategies that have succeeded in overcoming challenges to community organizing particular to Pilsen. The final product was a written report to the Pilsen Alliance staff recommending community-building methods and justifying those recommendations.

Our community partners consistently tell us that they do not have sufficient staff resources to initiate and implement the important research and communication projects that our CCLCP students undertake each semester. The consequential community-based projects profiled above stemmed from the significant time our students spent learning with community partners at nonprofit organizations. Students learned first-hand how participating in the daily activities of their partner organizations and how their much-needed community-based writing and research projects can drive social change. Writing, in these community-based contexts, becomes much more than a way to deliver knowledge to a teacher; students suddenly realize that writing makes things happen.

How Situated Writing Activates Civic Engagement

The notion of situated writing informs all first-year writing instruction at UIC insofar as all students are required to write in a variety of genres that respond to a range of situations. Most often, though, students' participation in a situation is imagined. For example, one typical writing project asks students to write a letter to the editor in support of or opposition to Latina author Sandra Cisneros, who painted her house in San Antonio, Texas, a bright purple in celebration of her own people's use of color, but against the local historic code for her exclusive neighborhood (Feldman, Downs, and McManus, 2005). While the situation is real, students' participation is imagined. In contrast, CCLCP, students find themselves immersed in the daily practices of nonprofit organizations—their "communities of practice," as I explain below—and become involved in pursuing the social or civic change these organizations seek.

Instruction in the UIC writing classroom views writing as action-oriented, or performative, rather than reflective. All our first-year writing instruction is framed by four rhetorically infused, but user-friendly concepts: situation, genre, language, and consequences. "Situation" asks students to consider the context for the writing. "Genre" draws attention to the form of the writing and how such forms shift and

evolve. "Language," as you might expect, focuses on whether the writing's syntax, diction, and grammar are appropriate to the context. "Consequences" brings us back to situation and asks, "So what?" What difference will the writing make? We can see how these terms have been applied in the CCLCP student projects described above. For North Lawndale Community News, the students used their research to produce a proposal for a business directory, a genre that could raise the profile of small business in the North Lawndale Community. For Pilsen Alliance, students wrote a research-based internal report that included recommendations for action.

As I said above, academics typically view writing as a way to deliver learning to the teacher. There is nothing wrong with that provided it is not the only way we think about writing. In conventional university classes, students read, study, and report to the professor on what they have learned; in traditional service-learning classes, "reflection" has become the predominant pedagogy, providing both the basis of student writing on experiences in the community and a method for coming to some understanding of those experiences, especially as they relate to the course's content (Feldman n.d.). Our view of writing is profoundly different. We know that writing is no less than a way of shaping, as opposed to reflecting, reality and this powerful force becomes obvious to students in the context of their partnership activities.

Situated writing, which is a performative, reality-shaping activity, depends on three closely related theoretical frameworks: genre theory, rhetoric, and social learning theory. We argue that all writing is situated in the social conditions that prompt it, and we believe that students take this axiom more seriously when an actual audience and a "real-life," complex, social context are elements of the writing situation. We see genre awareness as shaping our students' writing, giving us the opportunity to connect our emphasis on social context and local situation to important concepts in genre theory. Not merely a taxonomy of "types" of writing, genre theory asks students to redirect the focus of their writing from self to situation and onto the rhetorical conditions that constitute that situation (Bawarshi 153).

Genre theory obviously relies heavily on rhetoric and rhetorical theory, which constitute the second element of our triad. As Michael Bernard-Donals and Richard Glejzer (1998, 3) argue, rhetoric is best described as "the use of language to produce material effects in particular social conjunctures." If social situations materialize through rhetoric—which we feel they do—then we must direct our students to aim for awareness and understanding of the conditions that enable their own participation in and influence on social situations. Once they see and understand, students begin to think about their own possible participation in creating social change. When they consider the particular rhetorics employed in, for example, the genres of political speeches, manifestos, academic essays, and annual reports, students gain access to the powerful histories that often go hand-in-hand with certain words or phrases. Knowing these histories helps our would-be writers realize the motives and consequences of language when it is wielded as an agent of change.

And finally, given the "public" nature of both genre theory and rhetoric, our situated writing pedagogy draws on social learning theory. Our notion of social learning is based on the work of Etienne Wenger, who argues that practice, which he defines as the interaction of social entities, is both "a process by which we can experience the world and our engagement with it as meaningful" (1998, 51) and a "shared history of learning that requires some catching up for joining"(1998, 102). Quite simply, learning takes place through social engagement and, of course, through doing. And so, in CCLCP, we ask our students to engage in the social situations of our community partners, which emerge from life in urban Chicago. Pedagogically speaking, we echo Wenger when he argues that "learning cannot be designed; it can only be designed for" (1998, 229), which helps explain our insistence that collaborative knowledge-making requires the ability not only to design well-informed plans, but also to roll with the punches when those plans are disrupted and must change, as they so often do. In other words, student learning is often beyond our control; the more we, as CCLCP instructors, recognize this, the better the experience for all involved. In sum, because our pedagogy thrives upon social situations, both within and beyond classroom walls, we seek to make those walls as porous as possible.

A Great Cities Agenda for Faculty Research

From the beginning, UIC's interest in engagement focused on how its research and scholarship might contribute to Chicago's enhancement as a "great city." UIC is one of a few college campuses built from scratch and intended to be a presence in the "inner city" (Muthesius 2000, 200). Its brutalist architecture, starkly modern and concrete, was designed by Walter Netsch. This wholly new campus, built in 1965, was in part a response to urban renewal and was intended to provide higher education to the racially diverse, low-income population that surrounded it. However, this hoped-for legacy is tainted by the memory of local residents' vigorously fought battle for their homes and neighborhood. From another perspective, the campus that rose on the ground of that local battle reflected the hubris of the uber-architect who operated in a space beyond local neighborhoods. According to an editorial by Oscar Newman in 1996 published in Architectural Forum, UIC embodied the "design of the ideal while the refuse of the real accumulates around us" (Muthesius 2000, 196.) This complicated beginning still influences everything that UIC is and does.

In the early 1980s, after merging with the University of Illinois Medical School, which resulted in UIC's Carnegie Research I designation, the university continued to build its profile as a research university, putting aside its founding mission to serve the surrounding city. Eventually, a group of administrators and faculty members responded to the lingering concern for the "urban mission" that UIC was ignoring and imagined a way to resuscitate UIC's legacy as part of the land-grant college system. Rethinking how the university could develop a more symbiotic relationship with its metropolitan surroundings led to the development of the Great Cities Institute (GCI) and UIC's self-designation, in the new parlance, as an engaged university. Included under the GCI umbrella are two urban policy research centers; partnerships with two adjacent neighborhoods; a year-long, campus-wide faculty scholar program; a campus-wide

seed grant program; research programs conducted by institute fellows; and a professional education initiative. In short, then, the university developed a new infrastructure for its Great Cities Initiative, but more important, it launched an institutional agenda that offers faculty members an opportunity to reframe their research as engaged scholarship.

This sort of engaged institution is committed, as Barbara Holland explains, to "direct interaction with external constituencies and communities through mutually beneficial exchange, exploration, and application of knowledge, expertise and information" (Holland 2004; Holland 2001; Perry 2004). In this new context of engagement, faculty research is defined not solely by historical disciplinary standards, but by its ability to incorporate a wide range of stakeholders who bring to the table both vernacular and academic ways of knowing. The new dialogues that result from collaborative projects that cross university boundaries produce radically different kinds of knowledge. Michael Gibbons, working with an international team of sociologists (Gibbons et al. 1994), characterized this institutional shift as a radical, epistemic change that is transdisciplinary, demand-driven, entrepreneurial, and collaborative. For example, UIC Professor Olivia Gude initiated the Chicago Public Art Group which partners with "city agencies, private firms, and other organizations to produce community-oriented, site-integrated, public artworks in which artists work with architects, designers, and engineers" (Gude 2000, 2). This new group illustrates how transdisciplinary, reciprocal partnerships work. To proceed, the organization identifies a site-specific idea for developing a "place" and engages all stakeholders in a dialogue. The group moves ahead collaboratively to conduct research, explore the site, develop a budget, actually create the space, evaluate its use, and celebrate its presence (Feldman et al. 2006).

We are very familiar with the traditional model of discipline-based knowledge production in which research problems are conceptualized and studied through the lens (i.e., academic interests) of a specific group. This mode of knowledge production, called Mode 1 by Gibbons and others, emerged from a view of hard science in which activities and practices take place within an agreed-upon paradigm. An emerging model, called Mode 2 by Gibbons and his co-authors, emphasizes the "broader, transdisciplinary, social and economic contexts" of knowledge production (Gibbons et al. 1994, 1). In this materializing paradigm, knowledge is produced in a "context of application" that will likely extend outside the institution's walls to link up with a network of knowledge sources and interested parties (1994, 3). Rather than being guided by the conventions of a particular discipline, problem-solving is organized and implemented in response to the demands of a particular application. Such research typically crosses disciplinary boundaries, encourages new methods of knowledge production, and involves stakeholders as participants in research rather than as the subjects of research.

Changes in research practices are having a ripple effect through the rest of the academy, creating tension around time-honored processes for evaluation of research for the purposes of promotion and tenure. The shift to Mode 2 research has certainly been driven by globalization and computing technology, but perhaps more important is

an ongoing and multisided conversation about who is qualified to produce knowledge and about what constitutes expertise (Brukhardt et al. 2004, 11). Whereas the quality of traditional research has been determined by peer review, the quality of a Mode 2 project suggests additional considerations such as: "Will the solution...be competitive in the market? Will it be socially responsible?" (Gibbons et al. 1994, 8). This expanded view of making knowledge has been a driving force for engaged universities as they imagine what might be gained by research embedded in transdisciplinary contexts.

How Discourse Links Faculty Engagement to Undergraduate Learning

Thus far I have argued for engaged research as transdisciplinary, participatory, and reciprocal. However, above all, engaged research is discursive; as the academic faculty member proceeds in collaboration with others, he or she constructs a representation of a situation through language. Indeed, such writings, or discursive representations, can be thought of as "situated rhetorical performances" (Petraglia 2003, 163) that advocate for specific realities. Such a mission not only changes the relationship of the university to its surrounding metropolis or region, but also changes student learning. The link, I claim, between civic engagement and student learning becomes strikingly obvious through our use of written discourse.

Visionary thinker Ernest Boyer argued that universities should be seen as "staging grounds for action." In his last talks, however, he elaborated his notion of engaged scholarship by underscoring the importance of language to taking action. He explained, "The scholarship of engagement also means creating a special climate in which the academic and civil cultures communicate more continuously and more creatively with each other, helping to enlarge what anthropologist Clifford Geertz describes as the universe of human discourse and enriching the quality of life for all of us" (Glassick 1999; Boyer 1990).

Most important, Boyer notes that it is discourse, itself, that enables collaborative knowledge-making among the many stakeholders who may work under the aegis of the engaged university. In this context, the rhetorical function of language is critical. We must also acknowledge that the university is not the sole and only acceptable producer of knowledge. The university is but "one of many" knowledge centers and the relationships we establish with others must be "more fluid, more interactive, and more activist" (Walshok 1999, 85). The engaged university is defined by its communicative potential, and scholars, students, and community partners should see a Geertzian "thick discourse" at the center of their work.

An increased attention to discourse, often characterized as "the rhetorical turn," is an established feature of scholarly work in the humanities, yet its lessons are quickly subsumed by the overwhelming belief that writing mirrors reality. Discipline-based scholars long ago noticed the ways in which language constructs reality (Nelson, Megill, and McCloskey 1987). More important, this turn (or return) to rhetoric, has

"rejected the conventional split between inquiry and advocacy," pushing us to consider how guidelines for thick discourse can also become guidelines for action (Simons 1990, 4). Where advocacy was once seen as the province of the public and making knowledge was seen exclusively as the province of the university, the rhetorical turn brings the two together through writing. Writing, or discourse, can now be seen as critical and consequential in framing a situation rather than merely as, "writing it up," or the final step in a research project.

The Chicago Civic Leadership Certificate Program (CCLCP) illustrates how writing, or discourse, links faculty members with students in their shared pursuit of the knowledge to be gained through engaged research. Until the Chicago Civic Leadership Certificate Program started in 2004, no programmatic undergraduate academic opportunity for civic engagement existed at UIC. Faculty, as mentioned above, had been involved in extensive community-based research and individual faculty members involved students in community-based experiences as time and circumstances allowed. In fall 2008, as instructors of CCLCP's second-year courses, two UIC faculty both deeply involved in community-based, collaborative research, planned courses that not only involved students in their disciplinary subject matter but also demonstrated to students how core disciplinary questions are explored in community contexts. Professor Edison Trickett, who studies community organizations from an ecological, or systems, perspective, worked with students at, among other organizations, World Relief, a refugee support center. His students researched how a board of directors that could contribute to that organization's mission might be formed. Professor Lorena Garcia, a sociologist who studies Latina youth and gender using qualitative and ethnographic research, worked with students who researched how a gang and violence prevention organization might operate more effectively. What was new for these faculty members was CCLCP's focus on writing, rhetoric, and research, which provided ways of connecting to students beyond transmitting course content. Certainly engaged scholarship requires faculty members to see themselves embedded in particular situations, both inside and outside the university, and to consider carefully how they collaborate with others to define research partnerships. CCLCP, however, created new teaching and learning situations for Professors Trickett and Garcia, who had to consider how they might craft community-based contexts in which undergraduates learn how writing and discourse function to generate new knowledge. Professors Trickett's and Garcia's students, who had already taken two CCLCP courses during the previous year at UIC, understood that as they worked in community contexts on consequential and much-needed projects, their key tools were writing and rhetoric. Situated writing, then provided a link that is absent in many service-learning experiences in which the service, or civic engagement, happens in the community and the writing happens in the classroom. Here, in the Chicago Civic Leadership Certificate Program, we are bringing engaged faculty researchers together with students to help students become better writers. And, as I claimed at the outset, better writers are civically engaged writers.

References

Bawarshi, A. S. 2003. *Genre and the invention of the writer: Reconsidering the place of invention in composition.* Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press.

Bernard-Donals, M. F., and R. R. Glejzer. 1998. *Rhetoric in an anti-foundational world: Language, culture, and pedagogy.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Boyer, E. L. 1990. *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate.* Princeton, N.J: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brukhardt, M. J., B. Holland, S. L. Percy, and N. Zimpher. 2004. *Calling the question: Is higher education ready to commit to community engagement? A Wingspread Statement.* University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee: Milwaukee Idea Office.

Feldman, A. M. 2008. *Making writing matter: Composition in the engaged university.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Feldman, A. M., N. Downs, and E. McManus. 2005. *In context: Reading and writing in cultural conversations.* 2nd ed. New York: Addison, Wesley, Longman.

Feldman, A. M., T. Moss, D. Chin, M. Marie, C. Rai, and R. Graham. 2006. The impact of partnership-centered, community-based learning on first-year students' academic research papers. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning,* 13 (1): 16.

Feldman, A., D. Chin, C. Gottschalk-Druschke, T. Hennigsen, T. Moss, M. Pavesich, N. Pittendrigh, and S. T. Reich. n.d. Working paper. How reflection undoes service learning.

Gibbons, M., C. Limoges, H. Nowotny, S. Schwartzman, P. Scott, and M. Trow. 1994. *The new production of knowledge: The dynamics of science and research in contemporary societies.* London: Sage.

Glassick, C. 1999. Ernest L. Boyer: Colleges and universities as citizens. In *Colleges and universities as citizens,* eds. R. G. Bringle, R. Games, and E. A. Malloy. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Gude, O. 2000. Placemaking in Chicago. *Chicago Public Art Group News-Magazine,* 7 (1).

Henningsen, T., D. Chin, A. Feldman, C. Gottschalk-Druschke, T. Moss, N. Pittendrigh, and S. T. Reich. n.d. Forthcoming. A hybrid genre supports hybrid roles in community-university collaboration. In *Going public: The WPA as advocate for community engagement.* Logan, Utah: Utah State University Press.

Holland, B. A. 2001. Toward a definition and characterization of the engaged campus: Six cases. *Metropolitan Universities: An international forum,* 12 (3): 20-29.

———. 2004. Building and sustaining community-campus partnerships. Keynote address to Ohio Campus Compact/Wright State Conference on Civic Engagement, Dayton.

Muthesius, S. 2000. *The postwar university: Utopianist campus and college.* London: Yale University Press.

Nelson, J. S., A. Megill, and D. McCloskey, eds. 1987. *The rhetoric of the human sciences: Language and argument in scholarship and public affairs.* Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Newman, O. 1966. The new campus. *Architectural Forum,* 5:30-56. St. Louis, MO: Forest Park Community Center by Harry Weese & Associates.

Perry, D. 2004. The great cities commitment: Leadership, resources, rewards and the identity of the urban research university. Paper, University of California at San Diego, Seminar on the Research University as Local Citizen.

Petraglia, J. 2003. Identity crisis: Rhetoric as a pedagogic and an epistemic discipline. In *The realms of rhetoric: The prospects for rhetorical education*, eds. J. Petraglia, and D. Bahri. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Simons, H. W. 1990. The rhetoric of inquiry as an intellectual movement. In *The rhetorical turn: Invention and persuasion in the conduct of inquiry*, ed. H. W. Simons. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Walshok, M. L. 1999. Strategies for building the infrastructure that supports the engaged campus. In *Colleges and universities as citizens*, eds. R. G. Bringle, R. Games, and E. A. Malloy. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Wenger, E. 1998. *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity.* Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Author Information

Ann M. Feldman is a professor in the department of English at the University of Illinois at Chicago. She has held fellowships at UIC's Great Cities Institute. Her scholarly work focuses on genre theory, writing pedagogy, and higher education studies. She directs UIC's First-Year Writing Program and the Chicago Civic Leadership Certificate Program.

Ann Feldman
Professor of English
Department of English (MC 162)
2001 University Hall
601 South Morgan Street
Chicago, Illinois 60607
E-mail: feldman@uic.edu
Cell Phone: 773-294-7892
Fax: 312-413-1005