Taking the Pulse of Communication Across the Curriculum: A View from the Trenches

DEANNA P. DANNELS

"Undergraduate education must enable students to acquire strong com-
munication skills...[F]rom the freshman seminar to the senior capstone
course, communication skills should be integrated with the subject mat-
ter." (Boyer Report, 1998, *Reinventing Undergraduate Education*).

THE communication across the curriculum movement was alive and well before the
Boyer Report on Undergraduate Education, yet it received a stamp of support,
approval, and encouragement with Boyer's acknowledgement of the importance of
communication skills across the curriculum. Subsequent public reportage propelled the
communication across the curriculum movement to center stage in many national conver-
sations. A recent issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education claimed the importance of
"taking aim at student incoherence" and explored the extent to which communication
across the curriculum programs do this (Schneider, 1999). The *LA Times* (Mehren, 1999)
and the *Boston Globe* (Zernike, 1999) both spotlighted articles suggesting the horror of
"mallspeak" in university settings and highlighting speaking across the curriculum centers
as providing valuable support in reducing inarticulate speech.

Amidst this national attention, though, the CXC[i] movement has faced some
internal growth and change. In the 1999 National Communication Association debate,
"Communication Across the Curriculum: Friend or Foe," supporters and opponents of
CXC identified challenges and potential benefits facing the movement in the upcoming
years, including but not limited to the need for increased theoretical sophistication and
depth. A wealth of subsequent articles have challenged CXC directors and scholars to
move in similar new directions. Morello (2000) argues that CXC scholars must explore
(similar to the writing across the curriculum movement) "unique and innovative applica-

tions of rhetorical and communication theory in the context of oral communication activities across the curriculum" (p. 111). Dannels (2001) furthers this call by claiming that "even if CXC programs and scholars have been engaged in the theoretical work of the discipline, they have not made this well known... many are committed to complex notions of learning theory and communication practice, yet we are lacking in our efforts to make this a public part of our discipline's scholarly discourse" (p. 146).

Aside from the call for additional theoretical and scholarly CXC work, other articles identify a more practical challenge—the lack of central resources and information about CXC programs. Cronin, Grice, & Palmerton (2000) identify recommendations for the movement focused on facilitating access to OCXC information, sustaining OCXC programs, and providing more active leadership regarding OCXC—all of which depend on a more centralized notion of the movement and its resources (p. 81). Additionally, Proceedings from the 2001 NCA Summer Conference define guiding principles and action recommendations for the future of the movement. One of these recommendations was to "centralize program information and resources" for current and future directors (see the NCA Proceedings of the 2001 Summer Conference, "Engaging 21ˢᵗ Century Communication Students").

These recent calls for scholarship, theoretical sophistication, and centralized resources indicate a time of reflection and growth. The CXC programs of the past 25 years did an excellent job gaining status for the movement, placing communication across the curriculum at the center of national discussions, and creating a collective wisdom of directors to pass along to those who are just beginning in the movement. Yet the CXC programs of the past two decades years are different than those emerging, thriving, and growing today and from those that will flourish in the next two decades. There are limited places, though, that catalogue current CXC programs, audiences, activities, and challenges (for the most recent review of CXC programs, see Tomlinson). Finally, there are even fewer places where the voices of current directors—those who work with CXC issues day in and day out—are the voices that give meaning and definition to the movement itself. This article represents a step in this process.

This article describes the status of the CXC movement from the voices of current CXC directors nationwide. In this article, I represent directors' perspectives about their CXC programs in four ways: facts and figures, program descriptions, challenges and points of resistance, and looking to the future. Based on these descriptions, I discuss several implications for CXC programs and scholars and identify five recommendations for the movement. Ultimately, I argue that the pulse of CXC is strong, but the continued health and growth of the movement is in need of attention in areas of publicity, assessment, scholarship, institution-specific program structures, and discipline-specific resources.

METHODOLOGY

The relative lack of public documentation of CXC programs led to three stages of data collection. First, I sent an initial e-mail survey instrument (Saris, 1991) to several databases most applicable to CXC programs. For this survey, five databases were surveyed: 1) SAC Newsletter membership list, 2) NCA Communication Across the Curriculum listserv, 3) DePauw University database of current program directors, 4) Tomlinson database of current program directors, and 5) NCA CRTNT list serv.[2] The initial survey asked general program demographic questions and facts and figures regarding clients, structure, mission, and activities. Of 35 known CXC directors, 27 responded to the initial survey. This response rate of 74% is well within range of acceptable response

rates for e-mail surveys. Of those 27 responses, four indicated that their programs had been cut due to financial constraints (15%); which left 23 full responses.

Second, I sent a follow up survey to those program directors responding to the initial request. The second survey asked more interpretive questions regarding directors' opinions of challenges, resistance, and future directions. In this second round, 19 of the 23 original directors responded to this follow-up survey. Finally, for those programs that listed website addresses, I reviewed any web-based materials to gather more specific, in depth information about the program. The review of the web-based materials was completed to supplement the directors' responses to the survey (See Appendix A for a database of programs responding to this study). Survey responses were then compiled into an anonymous database that removed director name and institutional affiliation.[3]

In analyzing this data, I used a combined grounded theory and content analytic framework (Holsti, 1969; Glaser and Strauss, 1967). As an overall perspective, I worked from an inductive analytical framework committed to reducing data, comparing categories, and drawing conclusions (Miles and Huberman, 1984). My unit of analysis was a coherent "theme" (Kerlinger, 1986). For each survey question, I identified thematic categories, and then placed subsequent responses into those thematic categories. I then counted the number of thematic responses in each category to calculate frequencies. For example, one question asked about institution location. Responses were grouped in geographical location categories (West, East, Midwest, etc.). Another question asked about budgetary support and responses were grouped in numerical categories (under $1000, release time only, $5000-$10,000, etc.). Topical categories such as "challenges" were grouped according to thematic responses—for example, responses such as "budget," "money," and "funding" were placed in a category titled "resources." Sample survey responses were given to an independent coder and produced a 87% reliability rate.

In the final stage of analysis, I looked at the ways in which the general themes of all categories compared and contrasted and explored more fully the specific ways in which these categories functioned together to speak to the CXC movement as a whole. In this phase, I looked for common threads existing in emerging categories, identified general regular patterns among categories, and looked at those patterns for their implications on future action.

RESULTS

Results of this study are intended to be descriptive in nature. Whenever possible, I include data that are direct quotations from surveys to provide color and depth to the numbers. In this section, I describe the status of communication across the curriculum in four parts: facts and figures, program descriptions, challenges and points of resistance, and looking toward the future.

Facts and Figures

In this section, I provide basic descriptive facts about CXC programs. I depict CXC programs according to their institution type and size, institution location, program location and collaboration with institutional partners, and source of program support.

Institution type and size. Of the surveyed programs in this study, 45% existed at public universities, 32% at private universities, and 23% at private colleges. Table 1 details the relative sizes of these institutions in terms of student enrollment. Although the private vs. public ratio is somewhat even (45% at public institutions, 55% at private universities or colleges); the majority of programs exist at institution enrolling between 1000-5000 students (55%), with the 22% of the programs at institutions enrolling over 20,000 students.

Table 1

CXC Program by Institution Type and Student Body Numbers

Type of Institution	Total Percentage	1,000-5,000 students	5,000-10,000 students	10,000-15,000 students	Over 20,000 students
Public	45	9	10	13	13
Private, Liberal Arts University	32	23			9
Private, Liberal Arts College	23	23			
Total	100	55	10	13	22

Institution location. Table 2 illustrates the locations of the institutions surveyed in this study. As indicated, most of the CXC programs exist in the Southeast (43%), with many also in the Midwest (26%).

Program location and collaboration with institutional partners. Program locations varied across institutions. Table 2 illustrates typical program locations. The majority of programs are located in Departments of Speech/Communication (41%) while another portion are located at the college level (27%). Of the programs responding to the survey, 64% described some form of informal or formal collaboration with other institutional partners. Typical institutional collaborators included councils of general education, departments of business, English departments, writing centers, career centers, teaching centers, and other student programs (project Excel, extended campus programs, leadership programs, information technology, etc.).

Table 2
Institution Location

Regional Location	Percentage of Programs	States of Program Locations
Southeast	43	Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Florida
Midwest	26	Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota
Northeast	13	Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania
West	13	Utah, Colorado, Alaska
Other	4	Australia

Table 2

Program Location Within Institution

Program Location	Percentage	Typical Responses
Department of Communication	41	Two programs located in departments that were combined with English
College Level	27	Arts and Sciences, Humanities
Centrally Located	23	Tutorial Services, Centers, General Education, Academic Affairs
Other Disciplines	9	Business, Engineering

Program budget and resources. Of the programs surveyed, 64% are supported by some form of university budget. This support typically includes combination of release time, departmental budget[iv], and general college or university funds. 18% of the programs are fully supported by an external agent—an endowment or center. 14% of the programs started with support from an external agent and are now supported exclusively by an internal, university budget.

Program Descriptions

In this section, I report results that identify four general descriptive characteristics of communication across the curriculum programs: program type, program mission, program clients, and typical inquiries facing to communication across the curriculum programs.

Program type. Program directors were asked to identify their program in terms of its primary descriptive characteristic and type. Table 3 illustrates general program descriptions and describes typical activities associated with these descriptions. The most common types of programs were combined faculty development/ student support (32%) and intensive programs (27%). Of the programs that were characterized both by faculty development and student support (32%), typical activities included workshops for faculty and students, stipends for participants, mentor or fellow programs, and some form of ongoing training. These programs engaged in training and development for faculty and students across campus—not necessarily targeted to one course or assignment, but rather to the communication activities they were designing or assigned in a variety of different courses. Programs characterized as "intensive" (27%) also included some form of faculty/student development targeted to those teaching intensive courses or to those taking intensive courses. Student support programs (23%) were labs or centers that provided support for students assigned oral assignments, and at times had contact with faculty in providing evidence of tutoring, but were mostly student centered.

Table 3
Description of CXC Programs and Activities

Program Description	Percentage	Typical Activities
Combined Student Support and Faculty Development	32	Workshops for students and faculty, consultations with students and faculty
Communication (Speaking) Intensive Program	27	Course designation, assignment review
Student Support	23	Lab or center to help students with speaking assignments
Faculty Development	18	Workshops, grants, retreats, fellows programs

Mission. Missions of the surveyed CXC programs all varied across institutions, yet five general themes emerged: communication competence (100%), speaking to learn (36%), combined competence and learning (36%), faculty change/teaching improvement (18%), and institution-specific goals (22%). Table 4 illustrates these missions and typical responses fitting under those missions.

Table 4
CXC Missions

Mission Statement Theme	Percentage of Mission Statements Including Theme	Samples of Mission Statements
Communication Competence	100	Speaking in public, small group competence, conflict management
Competence and Learning	36	Engage in professional discourses of field, speak critically and knowledgeably about content, engage in thoughtful discussion
Speaking to Learn	36	Learn content, begin asking questions about subject, critically analyze reading
Institution-specific missions	22	Further liberal-arts tradition, engage in ethical speaking, illustrate strong leadership as a woman
Faculty Change	18	Improve teaching, energize class rooms

All of the programs surveyed identified competence as a mission of their program, yet they all defined it in institution-specific ways. For example, many program missions identified communication competence beyond public speaking (20%): "we encourage support for speaking in all contexts—small group, public, and interpersonal," "we

help students face the communication situations that arise in every context," and "our program focuses on the increasing needs for training in teamwork, conflict management, and group discussion."

Additionally, a handful of programs (15%) expanded the notion of communication competence to include other forms of competence such as writing, reading, critical thinking, and leadership. One program mission states they "will advance students' abilities to communicate, both orally and in writing, in ways that are cogent and compelling." Another claims their mission is to "develop enhanced student computing, critical thinking, speaking, and writing skills in every undergraduate and graduate course."

Many programs also identified the goal and mission of using speaking or communication activities to improve learning (36%). For example, one program claims their mission is "to enhance subject area learning through active engagement in oral communication," while others claim "the speaking intensive program will enhance student learning," and "speaking intensive activities must support the instructional goals of the instructor." Still others identify both competence and learning as important goals in programs with expanded notions of communication (36%): "the program is a direct response to a commitment to both improving graduates' writing and speaking abilities and incorporating writing and speaking in to the classroom as powerful tools for teaching and learning in all curriculums."

In addition to broadening the notion of competence, many programs also identified faculty change and teaching improvement in their missions (18%). For example, one mission claims: "our academic mission is to reenergize classrooms and teachers, and to create more active classrooms and discussions." Another mission states: "Through using speaking activities, we work to help faculty understand the importance of active learning—that you learn something better when you speak it aloud."

Program clients. Table 5 illustrates the typical program clients identified by directors. As illustrated, schools of business represent the most frequently identified audience for communication across the curriculum (27%), while humanities (23%) and sciences (23%) also represent a large group of clients using these services. Within these general descriptions, departments such as economics, biology, chemistry, political science, and psychology were mentioned as frequent clients.

Table 5
Disciplinary Affiliations of CXC Clients

General Collegiate Category	Percentage Occurrence in Client List	Specific Departments
Business	27	Economics, Business Management, Business Administration
Humanities	23	History, English, Liberal Arts Major
Sciences	23	Biology, Chemistry
Social Sciences	18	Psychology, Political Science
Engineering	14	Mechanical Engineering, Chemical Engineering
Communication	14	Public Speaking Basic Courses
Education	9	Teacher Education, Special Education

Program inquiries. Just as CXC clients varied in their disciplinary affiliation, so too did the typical questions and inquiries of programs. Table 6 illustrates the typical program inquiries facing directors. Of note, although the largest majority of requests focused on public presentations (32%), these requests were primarily focused on discipline-specific public presentation information—assignment samples, responding to students, argument structures, and technical visual aids. Additionally, other requests such as teamwork (23%) and business communication (14%) were common.

Table 6

Typical Requests and Inquiries for CXC Programs

Topic of Request	Percentage of Occurrence	Sample Requests
Public Presentations	32	Discipline-specific genres
Teamwork	23	Small group task division, team roles and rules
Business Communication	14	Interviewing skills, conflict management with employees, networking
Protocols for Practice Sessions or Assignments	14	Student practice session formats
Speaking to Learn	9	Informal activities, group discussion formats
Evaluating Communication Activities	9	Grading sheets, sample model presentations

Program assessment. Given the increased importance of assessment in higher education (Astin, 1991; Shaeiwitz, 1999), the survey asked directors to identify the types of program assessment being completed. Table 7 illustrates the general types of assessment and some examples of those types. Of note, 41% of the programs identified "no current assessment measures" or "assessment measures in progress, nothing final." Of those programs that do have some form of assessment, 36% identified self-report data as the primary means and mode of assessment.

Table 7

Program Assessment Procedures

Type of Assessment	Percentage	Examples
No current assessment procedures or assessment procedures in progress	41	
Self-report data	36	Student surveys, faculty surveys, alumni and/or industry surveys
Outcomes-based assessment	14	Student portfolios, course-specific videotaping
Course Materials	9	Syllabi, assignment sheets, grading sheets

Challenges and Points of Resistance
　　　　In this section, I report results of the surveys that identify the common challenges facing program directors. Additionally, I describe the most frequently identified points of internal resistance (resistance from within communication departments) and external resistance (resistance from other departments and/or disciplines).
　　　　Common challenges for program directors. Table 8 identifies the most common challenges identified by directors. The most common challenge identified was a lack of discipline-specific materials for faculty and student workshop development (40%). For example, directors claimed: "the bulk of my time over the past four years has been spent in developing student and faculty workshops and supplemental materials for use by content area instructors," and "there are some materials available that are generic, but I get requests for discipline-specific materials and those just don't exist," and another director identified the challenge of "providing appropriate, specific materials to support faculty in other disciplines."

Table 8

Challenges Facing Program Directors

Challenge	Percentage of Directors Stating Challenge
Lack of Materials and Resources for Faculty Development	40
Faculty Support and Participation	33
Sustainability of the Program	27
Faculty Pre-conceptions about Communication	27
Staffing (Finding and Maintaining Qualified Directors and Support Staff)	20
Quality Control of Faculty across Disciplines using Communication Assignments	20
Growth and Managing all New Requests	20
Money/Budget	13
Time for Program Administration	13
Student Interest and Commitment to CXC Activities	13
Other	9

The second most frequent challenge identified by directors was getting faculty to participate in program activities (33%). One director claimed: "faculty are reluctant to attend campus-wide workshops," while another said: "getting faculty from other disciplines to give this a try is difficult." One program director affirmed this challenge and said "our program is based on voluntary participation, which means we have to basically coerce the faculty to attend—once they're here, they come back though." Similar to this challenge, directors also claimed that faculty pre-conceptions about communication and communication activities were points of resistance (27%). Sample statements include: "basic public relations is a challenge," and "speech communication has a poor image," and "faculty have beliefs about speaking that allow them to say 'I can't do it' or 'It doesn't fit in my class.'"

Directors also identified sustainability as a challenge for their CXC program (27%). One director claimed: "for a program in existence for almost 20 years, entropy is a major challenge," while another identified the challenge of "ensuring that all faculty teaching oral communication intensive courses understand the criteria in light of the fact that some who first proposed the courses no longer teach them." Another director stated that there is a challenge in "keeping the program vital and on track now that it has been in place for several years." Still others claimed, "starting up is one thing, but keeping it going is an even bigger challenge," and "with a 10-year reaffirmation approaching it is difficult to keep energy up in this initiative."

External resistance. Table 9 identifies the four general points of resistance from other disciplines. The most common type of resistance facing program directors nationwide is the belief that communication is not relevant to the target course or discipline (53%). Directors claimed: "I hear that communication is not relevant to science courses, or math courses, or even English courses—pretty much fill in the blank," and "they view communication as ancillary to disciplinary knowledge...and we are in a position of failing before we have the possibility to succeed because we are already irrelevant in their minds." Another director claimed: "we have to sell this to them—to show them how communication is relevant to chemistry 100, to engineering 331, to history 450—they don't think it is."

Table 9

Points of External Resistance

Point of Resistance	Percentage of Directors Identifying this Resistance
Relevance of communication activities to course or discipline	53
Sacrificing of disciplinary content for communication activities	40
Lack of time to learn about and incorporate communication activities	40
Lack of rationale for teaching something so obvious and natural	33
Institution-specific resistance	12[1]

[1] Institution-specific resistance included issues of transfer students, beliefs about student demographics, and maintaining enough sections of SI courses to meet requirements.

The other common point of resistance mentioned by directors was the notion that communication activities take away from content (40%). Directors claimed: "they argue more speaking will sacrifice their precious content," "making courses intensive takes time away from course content," "faculty fear activities will push content out of courses" and "faculty ask 'why do we have to teach oral presentations? Why can't we just work on content issues?'" Finally, directors claim: "they can't see that these activities help students learn their content, not take away from it," and "faculty don't want to make speaking a very high percentage of course grade because they believe it is separate from content."

A third point of resistance mentioned by directors was the belief by faculty in other disciplines that there is simply not enough time to learn about, practice, and teach oral communication (40%). Directors stated that faculty did not see the "benefit of time spent on oral communication activities," "there's no class time for so many presentations," "there's some resistance in working out the required number of presentations in classes with larger numbers of students because of time issues," and "initially, the greatest resistance stemmed from faculty concerns that including communication assignments and activities in courses would be very time-intensive."

The final point of resistance identified by program directors was a belief that communication is obvious and natural, and therefore does not warrant instructional time (33%). Directors stated: "they don't understand what we do and why—they think it is just something you learn naturally," "part of this resistance comes from a widespread belief that speaking is informal, unplanned, and unstructured—I hear the phrase 'just get up and talk about it,'" and finally "mainly, I just have to get used to people calling my field rudimentary and obvious."

Internal resistance. 87% of the directors surveyed in this study reported having support from their departments, colleges, and universities. Although they identified difficulties in "making curriculum changes," "finding appropriate staffing and directors," and "administrative issues" for the most part the directors did not identify blatant internal resistance on their home campuses. Resistance that was explicitly stated (13%) focused on resources, departmental politics, and simple lack of interest.

Looking to the Future

In this section, I report results that identify program directors' beliefs about the future of the CXC movement, and the issues that will define its relative level of success. Table 10 identifies the critical issues mentioned by program directors for the future health of CXC.

Table 10

Issues for the Future of the CXC Movement

Critical Issue Facing the Future of CXC	Percentage of Directors Identifying this Issue
Creating public relations and marketing materials	28
Creating discipline-specific instructional materials	24
Connecting with other campus initiatives	20
Engaging in research and scholarship	20
Focusing on differences between needs facing CXC in small vs. large institutions	13
Training and maintaining qualified CXC directors	13
Maintaining the quality of instruction in other disciplines	6

One of the most frequently identified issues for the future health of the CXC movement was the creation of public relations and marketing materials that are designed to persuade faculty in other disciplines that communication is relevant and important to their disciplinary courses (28%). Directors claimed: "we need to change their minds and do so in a responsible way so they see how we fit in their discipline," "getting buy-in from faculty and students," "just basic PR, "and "we need to create materials that will sell our programs to outlying disciplines."

Directors also claimed the future of CXC rests on our ability to create discipline-specific instructional materials (24%): "we need to explore what colleagues can tell us about their discipline-specific rhetorical norms," "creating instructional materials that are

authentically discipline-specific," and "the rhetorical norms are different and it is not only useless but dangerous to let a student think that academic/civic communication behaviors will cut it in a business environment, for example." Finally, one director claimed: " we need to help individual departments and disciplines take ownership and design their curricula accordingly."

Directors also identified the need for research and scholarship as a key issue for the future (20%). One director claimed: "CXC scholarship and research exists, we just need to do a better job of making it public and central on the national stage. Another director summarizes this issue clearly:

> RESEARCH, RESEARCH, RESEARCH. We need to know what works and what doesn't and why. We need to know what people need, think they need and why. We need to know the particular skills that are important, how those are best learned and the dimensions of the environment (pedagogical and administrative) that best serve the development of those skills. We need to be able to prove that we're effective but first we need to identify what we are trying to be effective at.

Directors also identified the need to connect with other campus initiatives (20%) and to focus on differing needs between small and large institutions (13%): "smaller schools need to know how to do SAC right where there is little full-time speech communication expertise on campus to use," "the requirements for CXC on a 20+ thousand student campus are so different, we can't treat everything the same," and "we need to institutionalize the program with an extended campus academic directive," "we need to connect with English, to emphasize the similarities and differences between speaking and writing...we should prepare students to excel in many contexts," and "we will sustain our programs if we become part of the institutional fabric—which means we need to create partnerships with other undergraduate education initiatives."

Other directors claimed the critical issue for the future is training and sustaining qualified directors (13%): "increasing the supply of competently trained individuals who can serve as SAC program directors," "we need directors who are trained, and then we need to support them so they can create sustainable programs," and "our graduate schools need to help students become prepared to do this," and "graduate-level training is the key."

Finally, directors claimed that it is important to maintain the quality of communication across the disciplines (6%). One statement particularly reflected this idea: "The perennial issue remains: ensuring that students in across the curriculum courses get the preparation for assignments and the feedback on assignments necessary for them to learn from such experiences. Otherwise, simply having communication experiences will be of limited value."

DISCUSSION

In their recent article, "Oral Communication Across the Curriculum: The State of the Art After Twenty-five Years of Experience," Cronin, Grice, and Palmerton (2000) look back on OCXC programs, research, and experiences to provide strategies for the continued development of OCXC. Their work provides recommendations focused on program development, institutional resources, faculty development, and assessment. Ultimately, their article claims communication across the curriculum is alive and growing, and holds great potential across campuses.

This study supports the claim that the CXC movement is alive and well, and provides an important perspective on the movement from the vantage point of those who are currently directing, working in, and designing these programs. Based on the results of this study, several important issues for consideration emerge that support and expand Cronin, Grice, and Palmerton's review. First, the types of institutions supporting CXC programs are becoming more diversified. While many programs still find their home in small, liberal arts institutions, increasingly there are more and more programs at larger institutions with 20,000 or more students. These larger institutions (whether they be public, land-grant, or private) have particular restraints and opportunities that smaller institutions do not have. No longer can we claim CXC to be the domain of the small college—in fact, it is time to recognize the diversity of institution size and type and respond to it in ways that are useful for programs at those institutions.

Second, the CXC movement is facing a desperate need for discipline-specific resources. Over and over again, directors mentioned that they are receiving inquiries about discipline-specific resources, that their challenges are in finding discipline-specific materials, and that the future depends on such specificity. The challenge of "how is this relevant to my discipline" calls loudly for CXC scholars and practitioners to illustrate connections between communication theory and disciplinary knowledge and practice. CXC directors are increasingly being called to focus on discipline-specific genres, evaluation tools, and delivery issues—rather than generic instruction.

Third, results of this study suggest that the daily challenges and external points of resistance CXC programs face are not the same as the challenges put forth internally—by our own discipline. For example, in the 1999 NCA Debate: "Communication Across the Curriculum, Friend or Foe?" opponents of the CXC movement articulated several points of resistance: CXC weakens communication theory, CXC contributes to a poor image of our discipline, CXC drains resources from basic courses, and CXC deals primarily with surface issues (to name a few). Yet this study indicates that clients do not necessarily view CXC as a replacement to our basic courses. Directors did not report woes of diluted communication theory from faculty across campus—in fact, faculty across campus were actually interested in sophisticated discipline-specific instruction. Directors did not report worries by faculty across campuses that they were unable to teach oral communication—they simply wanted the rationale and resources in order to do this. Nor did the directors report that faculty and students across campus perceived that CXC meant the communication discipline was unnecessary or simply focused on surface issues. Essentially, this study illustrates that the very concerns that emerge in our own discipline about CXC are not realized in the practice or perceptions of other disciplines.

Fourth, it is clear that programs (both new and ongoing) are being increasingly faced with issues of sustainability—and there is a dearth of scholarship on CXC that could possibly contribute to the formative development and sustainability of these CXC programs. The lack of assessment models is glaring, and the need for scholarship to feed programmatic decisions is great. None of the program missions explicitly articulated a scholarly component', which implies that program directors are sustaining programs on the energy of a director, the commitment of champions, or the mandates of administration—not the seeds of scholarly inquiry. In fact, the 15% of programs that were cut and therefore unable to respond to the survey, all identified sustainability in leadership and resources as a key issue.

Finally, although programs are increasingly becoming more and more institution specific in their mission and goals, directors are facing challenges and points of resistance

that suggest a lack of centralized resources and support. That program directors across the nation face similar questions such as "how do I incorporate communication instruction without sacrificing content?" and "are there resources specific to my discipline?" implies that as a movement, we have not done an adequate job getting the word out to our clients. Although turnover in faculty participation will always generate some repetitiveness in the points of resistance, there seems to be a clear opportunity for an organizational response to the most frequently asked questions of program directors.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this study, several recommendations for program directors, scholars, and national leaders seem pertinent. These recommendations should be viewed as calls for action mostly for those involved as directors of programs. It should be noted, though, that several recommendations could be implied for institutions interested in adopting such a program, for the national office, and for disciplines interested in sending their faculty and students to CXC activities. Given the scope of this research was limited to program directors, recommendations are tailored toward that audience.

Create Discipline-Specific Materials, Resources, and Scholarship
The call for discipline-specific materials is absolutely clear. To do this, CXC directors and scholars need to explore what Dannels (2001) calls "communication in the disciplines." This framework calls for directors and scholars to create templates for speaking in engineering, mathematics, history, etc., that are grounded in scholarship about the genres, norms, evaluations, and knowledges that characterize the specific disciplines. Our writing-across-the curriculum (WAC) counterparts have done this in far more sophisticated ways than CXC scholars. This has not only benefited the WAC movement as a whole by raising the bar in terms of scholarship, but it has also benefited the disciplines with which WAC programs work. A similar framework committed to communication in the disciplines (CID) would not only respond to the inquiries and challenges facing current directors, but it would also generate scholarship about communication instruction, pedagogy, and competence that could ultimately benefit the creation of disciplinary materials. We can no longer respond to our clients solely with cookie-cutter instruction on communication—in fact—it does our movement an injustice to do so. Faculty in other disciplines are asking for more theoretically sophisticated resources—those that are grounded in their own disciplinary knowleges and content areas. It is up to those who lead these programs to respond to faculty in a way that does justice to the complexity of our theory and pedagogy.

Generate Institution-Specific Protocols for Program Administration and Structure
If CXC programs are no longer the domain of one-type of institution, it is critical that program directors and scholars address the specific needs and parameters that face different types of institutions. Programs that exist at an institution with relatively small (or even no) communication departments have different needs and should have different structures than those existing at an institution with a full load of graduate students, lecturers, and faculty in communication. The CXC programs existing at institutions without basic courses face different needs than those at institutions with large, multisection basic courses. If we adopt a "one size fits all" attitude, whether it be intentional or unintentional, we are asking for failure. Several good model programs exist—at a variety of different

institutions—and those models need to be explored and modified to acknowledge the particular challenges and structures of the cross-curricular movements.

Create Partnerships with Other Institutional Initiatives

As this study illustrates, sustainability of CXC programs is a critical issue. If this is the case, program directors should consider seriously creating partnerships with other institutional initiatives. Many current directors report success with such partnerships (writing, leadership, technology, etc.) and although these partnerships require thoughtful, strategic planning, they also could work to make CXC more a part of the institutional fabric of the university. Such partnerships could be initially explored as opportunities for grant writing or external funding that lead to more permanent structures and administrative support for all partners involved.

Make Systematic, Programmatic Assessment a Central Priority

CXC directors spend so much of their time planning, implementing, and facilitating the daily administration of their programs, that it is not surprising that assessment is lagging behind. This cannot continue, though, as more and more institutional programs are losing funding. CXC programs nationwide have to be able to illustrate and show they are working—that they are meeting the goals of their specific program and institution. In the past, self-report assessments were adequate for such a process. Now, with increasing pressure to engage in outcomes-based assessment, CXC programs must develop protocols. Numerous articles and conference presentations have made this charge, program directors need to take seriously the call and begin initiating conversations about what this assessment would look like in practice. Sophisticated program assessment will not only contribute to the growing scholarly body of work about CXC, but it will also help sustain programs over time in a somewhat tenuous university climate.

Consider Turning Administrative Questions into Scholarly Questions

The administration of a CXC program requires time, energy, and commitment. There is a possibility, though, that the time it takes to run a program necessarily means sacrificing research and scholarship. Yet there is no reason that CXC directors can't turn their everyday administrative questions into scholarly questions. Directors responding to this study articulated challenges, inquiries, and points of resistance—a wealth of information that could be explored in empirical ways. To what extent is resistance discipline-specific? Are disciplinary genres malleable over time? How does oral practice influence content knowledge? Blurring the line between programmatic questions and scholarly questions could spark research that contributes to communication theory in interesting and important ways. Directors spend plenty of time doing the work of the program—yet there is an opportunity to turn that administrative work into scholarly research that feeds program success in an empirically grounded way.

Use Public Relations Scholars and Practitioners to Generate Publicity Packages

Many universities and colleges have some form of public relations program. This is a resource that should not be overlooked by CXC directors. Getting the word out is often a challenge and a place we spend most of our time. Yet many of the directors (to my knowledge) are not trained in the best ways to do this. CXC programs would benefit from the resources available from public relations and marketing scholars and practitioners. This is a place where we could use the expertise of our colleagues (if available) and our students and also generate important materials for making sure faculty and students know about the program, have their common myths dispelled, and actually attend events.

CONCLUSION

The participants in this study provide a breadth of information about the daily life of communication across the curriculum programs nationwide. Results of this study indicate the pulse of the movement is strong, yet there are still areas for growth. Increasingly, higher education scholars, faculty in other disciplines, and members of the public are calling for communication instruction and presenting new challenges for directors and scholars to address. As a discipline we have an opportunity to respond in ways that reflect well on our theory and practice. If CXC programs are to be sustained over time and succeed in the next 25 years, it is critical that those involved in the movement take seriously the needs of our audiences. CXC programs must do more than repeat basic course material—they must consider the important genres, norms, and evaluative criteria that face their target disciplines so they can supplement general instruction with that which is more relevant to disciplinary classrooms. The focus on discipline-specific resources also opens doors for scholarly inquiry that, quite simply, needs to be done in a sophisticated, programmatic way. Additionally, although the internal debates about communication across the curriculum are important for reflection and growth—it is time to move beyond the question of "if" we should do CXC, but rather address "how" so that directors' and scholars' time can be spent on contributing to scholarship and disciplinary instruction.

Our responses to these issues will most certainly shape the future of CXC. As directors of CXC programs work on a daily basis to take our discipline out to other faculty, departments, and colleges; the work of these programs becomes pivotal in the ways in which other departments perceive the discipline of communication. For this reason, CXC programs become champions of our discipline and therefore central spaces for disciplinary reflection, growth, and assessment. The call from the trenches—directors' challenges, inquiries, points of resistance, missions, and future ideas—needs to be heard and addressed between directors, among scholars, and within communication departments nationwide. It is these conversations that will nurture the communication across the curriculum movement so that those involved can continue to assume proactive leadership that not only assures increased health of the movement, but also has a clear and loud voice in current and future conversations about undergraduate educational reform.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

Deanna P. Dannels (Ph.D., University of Utah, 1999) is Assistant Professor in the Department of Communication and the Assistant Director of the Campus Writing and Speaking Program at North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695-8104.

[1]Several acronyms have been used to identify communication across the curriculum programs including but not limited to CXC, CAC, SAC, and OCXC. For the purposes of consistency, I use the CXC acronym when referring to communication across the curriculum. When other sources, authors, and/or directors use a different acronym, I remain true to their language.

iiEvery effort was made to contact known program directors nationwide. It is possible and likely, though, that programs exist that are not in the five surveyed databases (and were therefore not represented in this study). Ideally, a centralized database will emerge that allows for continued maintenance and updating of CXC directors and programs. A copy of the survey instrument is available upon request.

iiiThe purpose of this study was to provide an overview of CXC programs, not to identify particular characteristics of specific programs. Therefore, director and program identification information was removed when data were compiled into a single database.

ivProgram directors, for the most part, did not provide specific budgetary information in the form of numbers in this survey—rather, they simply indicated the extent to which their program is supported internally or externally and the general type of support (full budget, release time, etc.). More specific follow-up questions were not asked, to respect directors who wished to maintain budgetary privacy.

vThe lack of an explicit scholarly component in program missions and descriptions does not necessarily mean scholarship is not happening. In fact, at regional and national conference, and to a limited extent—in reading national journals—there are several scholarly activities emerging. This study illustrates, though, the possible perceived gap between the scholarship that is happening and program planning, implementation, and assessment.

Astin, A. (1991). *Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education.* New York: Macmillan.

Boyer Commission on Educating Undergraduates in the Research University. (1998). *Reinventing undergraduate education: A blueprint for America's research universities.* NY: State University of New York.

Cronin, M.W., Grice, G.L., & Palmerton, P.R. (2000). Oral communication across the curriculum: The state of the art after twenty-five years of experience. *Journal of the Association of Communication Administration, 29,* 66-87,

Dannels, D.P. (2001). Time to speak up: A theoretical framework of situated pedagogy and practice for communication across the curriculum." *Communication Education, 50,* 144-158.

Glaser, B.G., & Straus, A.L. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory.* Chicago: Aldine.

Holsti, O.R. (1969). Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Kerlinger, F.N. (1986). Foundations of behavioral research, 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Mehren, E. (1999, March 22). Colleges, like, focus on speech. The Los Angeles Times, A1.

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Morello, J.T. (2000). Comparing speaking across the curriculum and writing across the curriculum programs. *Communication Education, 49,* 99-113.

National Communication Association (July 2001). "Engaging 21st Century Communication Students." *Proceedings of the National Communication Association Summer Conference, Washington, DC.*

Saris, W.E. (1991) Computer-assisted interviewing. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Schneider, A., (1999, March 26). Taking aim at student incoherence: Spread of speech programs across the curriculum irks some communications professors. Chronicle of Higher Education, A16.

Shaeiwitz, J. (1999). Outcomes assessment: Its time has come. *Chemical Engineering Education,* 102-104.

Tomlinson, S.D. (1999). Communication across the curriculum: Status of the movement and recommendations. Unpublished master's project, University of Washington, Seattle.

Zernike, K. (1999, January 31). Talk is, like, you know, cheapened: Colleges introduce classes to clean up campus 'mallspeak.' The Boston Globe, A1.

Appendix A
Database of CXC Programs Included in this Study

University	Program Name	Program Website and Update (if available)
Appalachian State University	Communication skills assessment	
Butler University	Communicating Across the Curriculum	
Clemson University	Pearce Center for Professional Communication	www.clemson.edu/caah/pearce/
Columbia College	Pearce Communication Center	www.columbiacollegesc.edu/special-pearce.html
DePauw University	Oral Communication Competence Program	www.depauw.edu/admin/acadaffairs/s.htm
Dickenson College		Program discontinued
East Tennessee State University	The Writing and Communication Center	www.etsu.edu/wcc/oci/index.htm
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University	Computing Across the Curriculum	
Hamline University	Speaking Across the Curriculum	www.hamline/edu/cla/academics/comm_studies/oral.html
Mary Washington College	Speaking Intensive Program	www5.mwc.edu/~spkc.sp.html
Mt. Holyoke College	Speaking, Arguing, and Writing Program	www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/programs/wcl/
North Carolina State University	Campus Writing and Speaking Program	www2.chass.ncsu.edu/CWSP
Oswego State University	Communication Across the Curriculum	
Randolph-Macon College	Oral Communication Intensive	
Ripon College	Communicating Plus Program	www.ripon.edu/academics/commplus/
Robert Morris College	Speaking Across the Curriculum	

University	Program Name	Program Website and Update (if available)
Southeast Missouri State University		Program inactive; under reconsideration
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs	Center for Excellence in Oral Communication	
University of Melbourne	Communication Across the Curriculum	
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	Oral Communication Program	Program inactive; undergoing reassessment
University of North Carolina at Greensboro	Speaking Across the Curriculum	www.uncg.edu/cac/
University of Northern Iowa	CBA Business Communication Program	www.cba.uni.edu/buscomm
University of Pennsylvania	Speaking Across the University	www.sas.upenn.edu/satu
University of Richmond	The Speech Center	www.richmond.edu/academics/support/speech/
University of Utah	Communication Across the Curriculum in Engineering	
Washington and Jefferson College	Communication Across the Curriculum	Program beginning under Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning in Fall 2001
Weber State University		Program discontinued