The CCCC Research Committee makes the following recommendations to the EC for consideration, in line with our charges to: recommend to the officers and EC and/or undertake specific projects intended to foster a culture of research within CCCC and to disseminate research beyond CCCC members, eg. in public venues; recommend to the officers and EC and/or undertake specific projects intended to foster research that represents underrepresented voices and subjects among CCCC members; and work with the Officers and EC to develop and implement additional programming or support research grant recipients. We note, in line with these charges, that some of our recommendations to the EC are also projects we could take on; we will discuss these at our upcoming meeting in Pittsburgh, and would be glad to hear from the EC in terms of interest in having us work on some of the projects we outline, within our capacities and domains of expertise.

We frame our recommendations with the following statement about research:

Methodological diversity in intellectual work is essential if *CCCC* is to remain a dynamic and inclusive site of knowledge-creation. The Research Committee honors the importance of all research approaches, including theoretical, critical-analytical, ethnographic, archival, hermeneutic… as indispensable means of advancing knowledge.

We also recognize, however, that there has been a reported imbalance within the field in terms of fostering, teaching, and valuing some forms of research methods and some populations and subjects studied (see for example North 1987; Charney 1996; Barton 2000; Haswell 2005; Miller 2014). We are thus proposing 1) ways to look carefully at the record of the kinds of research methods that have been less foregrounded or developed in CCCC venues and in the field more broadly (in Cs programs, in PhD coursework, in our flagship publications…), alongside the kinds of research topics, populations studied, and voices that have been less foregrounded in these same venues or that are urgently needed in the current writing studies landscape, and 2) to develop ways to foreground them. We make recommendations here that we think will help with this in the shorter term, the next three years (2019-22), in the context of a longer plan that should address issues that cut across all kinds of research.

The Committee recognizes that in terms of the methods of inquiry we are prioritizing here, they often require more substantial and costly infrastructure (e.g., transcription services, research assistants, software suites) than do hermeneutic approaches. Additionally, because these approaches often involve working with people and communities, they also often require time and training in culturally appropriate methodologies. These methods often also necessitate additional and/or ongoing specialized training and infrastructure for research groups rather than individual researchers. Since these approaches are often not well-represented in graduate curricula, those attempting to use them must also invest substantial time to retool or to gain more expertise in a particular method. Relatively few members of our field are in a position to absorb opportunity costs like these, and the consequences include an imbalance in the kinds of topics or populations studied as well as the types of scholars who can easily access such resources. In addition, the central effort currently being undertaken by the CCCC leadership to disseminate research that can inform public discourse and public policy would directly benefit from availability of research

developed via the methods of inquiry identified here. These methods, to paraphrase the definition developed by the Dartmouth Summer Seminar:

> (1) respond to a research question,
> (2) are grounded in previous research,
> (3) engage in systematic and/or reproducible inquiry,
> (4) reflect on or explicate their methodologies,
> (5) generate interpretable data,
> (6) extend existing knowledge, and
> (7) can be extended themselves through scholarly publication or other public contribution.

Recommendations for the next 2-3 years:

I. The Research Committee is charged with *recommending to the EC and/or taking on projects to disseminate research beyond the CCCC membership.* The Committee feels that this charge is exceptionally important because of its potential for something we feel is a priority: public dissemination of research and informing public discourse and public policy. Accordingly, we recommend to the EC that CCCC:

  A. Retain an NCTE public-policy specialist whose responsibilities would include:
    1. translating research findings for a broad public audience,
    2. lobbying Federal funders to shape their RFPs and review processes to admit writing research
    3. and provide professional guidance to all research award recipients in fulfilling their (obligatory) stated intention to design one of their research deliverables for a "specifically identified more public audience."

  B. follow the lead of the Brookings Institute in assisting this specialist in developing short, accessible multi-media summaries of important research studies

  C. develop a position statement on publishing academic material for public audiences and to charge (and support) a selected small group of published CCCC members in "translating" their work (e.g., to a lay audience; local communities; local educators; policy makers, etc.) so as to jump-start this initiative with a set of models

  D. be responsive to TYCA's initiative by making it a priority to work across institutional boundaries and design research projects that routinely include two-year colleges. With roughly half of all undergraduates completing their writing courses at two-year colleges, our organization must be much more intentional and proactive in the way we support, help theorize, and conduct research projects so that they routinely include two-year college institutions, personnel, and students. As Holly Hassel and Joanne Baird Giordano note in "Occupy Writing Studies," two-year college writing teachers urgently need "a more effective and extensive body of scholarship that offers research-based best practices that are relevant to the daily work that they do" (119).

  E. in calling for conference papers and research proposals, deliberately emphasize the asking and answering of questions that both contribute theoretically to writing studies and contribute socially to pressing issues -- in other words, make a public and visible commitment to research that has the potential to intervene in the public

F.   seek out available channels for collaborating with K-12 research

Note: the committee expects to collaborate with the EC on these items, as appropriate. We will be discussing this at our March meeting, in particular items C and D. We have included an Appendix with a sample of some of the kinds of tools we believe would assist the CCCC membership with some of these efforts.

II.   The Research Committee is charged to *recommend to the officers and EC and/or undertake specific projects intended to foster a culture of research within CCCC.* Accordingly, we recommend that

   A.   the EC immediately implement some information-collection measures in order to further build the organization's direct, CCCC-sponsored knowledge of where/how the kinds of resource-intensive inquiry described in our introductory notes are (or aren't) happening and why, as suggested in the introductory notes. Conducted thoroughly, this information-gathering would also help us to identify opportunities to support research by and with underrepresented methods/groups/populations. These might include:

   1.   Creating the infrastructure for an ongoing annual audit of CCCC programs, perhaps by including a drop-down menu of "method" options to select when proposing panels/papers or hiring a graduate student to audit past programs
   2.   Cross-referencing method in CCCC panel proposals along with category of topics.

   B.   the annual Convention feature
   1.   a CFP that is more explicit in its call for empirical research
   2.   a minimal number of reserved panels in the program for empirical-research panels, to ensure visibility of this research in the way that "classroom praxis" panels are currently visible; some panels should be led by Cs research initiative recipients.
   3.   an ongoing concurrent sequence of three full-day Wednesday workshops (Research I, II, and III) be established to build research capacity among the membership. Topics might include:

      a)   How to turn interests, curiosities, and institutional exigencies into answerable questions
      b)   Where to find funding sources and how to apply for grants (both CCCC grants and other grants); this could include representatives of various grant initiatives; how to find non-CCCC sources of grant funding and respond to the CFPs
      c)   How to write grant proposals.
      d)   How to collect and analyze data; best practices for moving from artifacts, observations, transcripts, etc. to queryable data; information about data analysis software including uses and limitations of particular softwares; best practices in data collection methods such as interviews and coding.
      e)   How to read and apply basic descriptive and inferential statistics.
      f)   How to report on and disseminate research findings both to academic and nonacademic audiences (and in terms of the latter, finding ways to help public-facing research efforts "count" in terms of promotion and tenure)

These sessions can be led in part by Cs members of the Research Committee, the Research Initiative judges and winners, editors of book series and journals, etc.

4. a "Day of Inquiry" to take place at the annual convention. This is a particularly ambitious proposal that would serve to: (a) welcome teachers, graduate students, and new attendees to the research communities and professional conversations of the C's; (b) showcase important inquiry of all types by C's members; (c) invite representatives of competitive funding sources to discuss their criteria and expectations, and allow conference attendees the opportunity to discuss their own views on needed research and funding priorities. If the EC is interested, we are happy to develop a separate, more detailed proposal.

5. a session by winners of and judges of Cs research grants on the types of funding available, how to "read" the funding RFPs, and write a grant proposal

C. CCCC publish a position statement on desired outcomes for research-methods curriculum in RCWS PhD programs.

Note: the committee expects to collaborate with the EC on these items, as appropriate. We will be discussing this at our March meeting, in particular items A, B3/B4, and C.

III. The Research Committee is charged to *recommend to the officers and EC and/or undertake specific projects intended to foster research that represents underrepresented voices and subjects among CCCC members.* Accordingly, we recommend that

A. funding be targeted to those doing research about teaching in non-PWI institutions

B. the organization carefully consider the results of its annual audit of CCCC panels (see II.A) for gaps and omissions in populations and institutions studied and reshape subsequent CFPs as well as research grant CFPs accordingly.

C. some scholarships be provided to members of these groups for participating in the Wednesday workshops we propose in II B above

D. a brief survey be developed and distributed by the research committee to gather information about what resources these traditionally under-supported groups need in order to participate more fully in research [we acknowledge that surveys can be complicated, and CCCC members can feel over-surveyed, but we feel this could work if we target it to clearly indicate that we intend to support these particular groups].

In addition, based based on several members' experiences serving on the Research Initiative and Emergent Research granting committees, we also recommend, in line with both this charge and our charge to *work with the Officers and EC to develop and implement additional programming or support research grant recipients*, that:

E. the Emergent-Research application include a good-faith certification that all applicants are in fact "emergent" in the sense of being early-career, have not previously engaged in funded research, and/or have little institutional support for research. This certification should explicitly direct those not meeting these criteria to pursue a Research Initiative grant instead.

F.   a third category of applications for CCCC research grants be established. This initiative would invite ambitious or grand proposals that are not conceptually constrained by resource concerns and promise to further empirical research on one specific problem of persistent and widespread importance to CCCC membership annually. (E.g., how FYC maps onto HS curricula; impact of dual enrollment or AP programs on FYC; what exactly can be said to be "advanced" about "advanced composition"; what CCCC can learn about writing and learning in disciplinary courses or general-education beyond FYC; what CCCC can learn about literacy practices from mapping populations other than students; what CCCC can study about racial disparity in educational outcomes of writing classes; attrition in "basic" writing classes; etc.). The "grand proposals" initiative might also invite proposals to create well-designed resources for other researchers (e.g., an open access corpus of student work, including POS tagging, with useful meta-data and relevant assignments/syllabi) and/or baseline data useful for the field (e.g., a survey of graduate-level research methods syllabi; an iPeds-like census of programs, etc.)

Note: the committee expects to collaborate with the EC on these items, as appropriate. We will be discussing this at our March meeting, in particular items D and F.

Finally, the Research Committee recommends, not in relation to any particular charge but important to our collective work, that
   ● the EC fund or establish a collaboration with *CWPA* and the Labor Resource Center to help build a research database that includes labor factors, working conditions, how faculty experience FYC, how various groups experience teaching composition and doing research: documentation of teaching experiences in relation to research
   ● the EC exploit shared relationships/representation on NCTE EC and Committees to explore joint research ventures in K-16

We will be discussing our role in these activities at our meeting in Pittsburgh, and are likely to submit a more detailed recommendation and a budget request at that time.