

TASK FORCE REPORT ON THE FUTURE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA INTERNATIONAL WRITING PROGRAM

Submitted to

President Mary Sue Coleman

Provost Jon Whitmore

September 29, 1999

I. Introduction 2*

II. Fiscal Issues 3

III. Directorship Models 4

IV. Administrative Homes for the IWP 6

V. Academic Links 9

VI. Program Size and Duration 10

VII. Housing 11

VIII. Conclusion 12

(* Page numbers refer to the printed report)

I. INTRODUCTION

Dean Linda R. Maxson appointed a task force in early June to produce a statement of academic mission for the IWP. Those appointed were Fred Antczak, Daniel Balderston, Sandra Barkan, Connie Brothers, Jim Harris, Mike McNulty, John Nelson, and Steven Ungar (Head). Larry Rettig served as recording secretary, starting with the July 23 meeting. (David Hamilton was appointed but withdrew in early July.) In a June 3 letter, Dean Maxson asked the task force to consider how the IWP might be made more fiscally viable without compromising its role in undergraduate and graduate curricula. After Vice-President Skorton agreed on July 9 to be responsible for the fall 1999 session of the IWP, a July 14 task force meeting attended by President Coleman, Dean Maxson, and Jon Whitmore resulted in a revised charge to consider 1) the administrative home for the IWP; 2) models for the IWP directorship; and 3) ways to enhance the IWP's interaction with academic programs. The task force agreed to file a report listing options for the three general issues with comments as to what it saw as their specific benefits and liabilities.

The task force met again on July 23, August 18, August 26, September 2, September 9, September 14, and September 23. Members of the task force were also invited to attend a July 29 Open Forum on the IWP and a September 22 session of the College of Liberal Arts Faculty Assembly.

The following report is based on materials made available to the task force through the Office of the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and the Office of the Vice-President for Research. These materials include the 1994-95 unit review report of the IWP and the March 1998 report submitted to the Office of the Provost by an ad hoc committee chaired by Professor Ed Folsom. Information related to fiscal management came in the form of a financial review provided by the Office of the Vice-President for Research.

The following report is to be considered a collective document. Its status is advisory with regard to future decisions The University of Iowa may choose to make, and it is not intended as a program review. The task force requests that this report be posted on the UI web site at a time the central administration deems appropriate. A first action was to endorse with unanimity a motion that the central administration do everything possible to ensure that the International Writing Program continue. This endorsement expresses a shared sense that the mission of the IWP is to bring writers from around the world to campus for an extended period of residency during which they pursue their ongoing projects, interact with others in the program, and contribute to the intellectual activities of the UI and Iowa City communities.

II. FISCAL ISSUES

A financial review provided by the Office of the Vice-President for Research indicates several sources of funds for the IWP over the years. This information, which includes the period 1988 through 1999, indicated the following sources: 1) UI General Education Fund; 2) Direct private gifts and funds secured from individuals; 3) UI Foundation; 4) Federal funds, including funds from the United States Information Agency; 5) other sources.

The proportion of funds provided by the UI General Education Fund has shown a steady increase. Over the eleven-year period in question, the General Education Fund has provided an average of 60% of the total budget for the IWP. UI Foundation accounts contributed an average of 14%, federal funds an average of 17%, other and miscellaneous sources an average of 7%, and direct private gifts & grants an average of 2%. Federal funding over the same period has been sporadic. The proportion of the IWP funding provided by federal sources has dropped significantly during the past decade, from 35% in FY ("Financial Year") 1988-89 to 15% in FY 1998-99. Over the same period, support from the General Education Fund increased from 42% to 70%. For three years during the period, there was no federal funding whatsoever. This increased reliance on UI General Education Funds has become a source of some concern and represents a major challenge for future funding.

In the past five years, annual private funding has decreased significantly. Foundation funding increased significantly between FY 1988-89 and FY 1989-90. It remained steady through FY 1996-97 except for FY 1992-93, when Foundation funding was double that of prior and subsequent years. Foundation funds were used to cover costs during the three years the IWP received no federal funding. Foundation funding decreased in FY 1998-99 to a level closer to that of FY 1988-89.

During the eleven-year period, the average amount of funds available to the IWP from all sources on an annual basis was approximately \$370,000, with a low of \$266,571 in FY 1989-90 and a high of \$491,135 in FY 1997-98. The program has run deficits in recent years. Its balance as of July 1999 stands at -\$106,426.87. These deficits appear related to years when federal funding was uncertain or fluctuated. They have also grown out of conditions that predate the period for which data was provided. The deficits have generally been carried on the UI Foundation line.

The decrease in overall external support between 1993 and 1997 has contributed in numerous ways to the strain on the IWP's operations. A reduction of annual support by the Office of the Provost from \$50,000 to \$25,000 in FY 1998-99 and from \$25,000 to \$0 in FY 1999-2000 was also a key factor in the IWP's current fiscal situation. The IWP needs to be able to do more than operate from year-to-year on a shoestring, with increasing dependence on UI resources. Greater attention to external sources of funding and fiscal management can enable this. Such attention is necessary, even apart from addressing the current debt and annual deficits. A plan for sustained fiscal management needs to be implemented.

III. DIRECTORSHIP MODELS

Funding changes of the past two years have heightened the urgency to implement a structure within the program to build a solid fiscal base (management as well as fund-raising) during a period when support from UI general funds and the USIA is unlikely to increase and may well decline. The likelihood of fluctuating levels of support calls, in turn, for greater emphasis on funding from corporate and private sources as well as large agencies such as the Ford Foundation, Japan Foundation, etc.

In light of our charge to explore models of the IWP directorship most likely to ensure the program's fiscal health over the coming decade, we list and comment below on a number of such models. For the sake of clarity, the expression Literary Director should be understood as a writer and/or translator appointed to the UI faculty and whose main duties are to

oversee all aspects of the IWP's operations. The expression Executive Director refers to someone who works with the Literary Director and whose duties include significant involvement with fund-raising and fiscal management.

The task force endorses the idea that any model for the IWP directorship should include a local advisory board with representation from UI faculty, the central administration, and the Iowa City community. DEOs of the modern language departments and related units in creative writing, comparative literature, and theater might serve on this board. Alternatively, they might constitute a separate group to work with the local advisory board in promoting curricular and extra-curricular interaction between the IWP and undergraduate programs within the Humanities and performing arts.

Option One - Literary Director with permanent faculty appointment: This has been the existing model for the past 32 years. It requires a Director appointed to the UI faculty to undertake fund-raising by scheduling blocks of time to travel around the country and abroad as well as short-term visits to meet with sources of ongoing or potential support. Travel abroad likely means mixed visits to USIA posts as well as national, local, and private agencies. These visits maintain relations with existing sources of support and writer recruitment. They also nurture relations with new sources.

Fund-raising must go beyond short-term contributions or recruitment of participants. The urgency to meet year-to-year deadlines tends to work against initiatives of longer term. Especially if the director expects to maintain a program of personal research and/or writing, the juggling of obligations can diminish the time devoted to fund-raising that will be increasingly central to the IWP's future.

Funding and writer recruitment are often equated to a point where the number of writers brought to campus in any given year serves as a measure of the IWP's fiscal health. To what degree can support funding be increased over a longer term from corporate sources and/or foundations not directly involved in recruiting specific writers? If support were given in conjunction with initiatives to occur over three to five years or more, the IWP would be less dependent on recruiting the highest possible number of writers each year in order to cover costs of annual operations. One possible initiative of a long-range nature might involve support for regional and/or national tours for the IWP participants. A second might enhance links to translation and publication of a series of books through the UI Press. Requests to corporate and foundation agencies to support annual conferences linked to translation and creative writing might also be explored. These conferences might be linked to organizations such as the American Literary Translators Association (ALTA) or the Midwest Modern Language Association (MMLA) and academic journals such as The Iowa Review and World Literature Today.

Two variations on the annual conference might also provide opportunities for fund-raising. The first is a visit from a former IWP participant invited to campus to conduct a reading to coincide with the birthday in late October of the IWP co-founder, Paul Engle. This event—which could last several days and include a number of activities—could be designated the object of a funding drive. An extension of this visit might take the form of an annual festival linked to readings and stage performances on campus. A ten-day festival over two weekends might provide high visibility for the IWP within the UI and Iowa City communities. The proposed Engle reading could be part of the festival as an outreach activity with a clear potential to attract private, local and regional sponsors. Both events would

highlight the IWP's presence and provide a showcase for prospective support.

Alternative models for the IWP directorship include: (option two) Director with non-faculty appointment; (option three) Literary Director appointed from UI faculty for a two to three-year term; (option four) Literary Co-Director & Executive Co-Director; (option five) Literary Director & Associate (Executive) Director. Discussion of these alternative models resulted in little or no support for options two, three, and four.

Option Five - Literary Director & Associate (Executive) Director: A division of duties and responsibilities with some overlapping might ensure that direction of the IWP would provide increased time for fund-raising and fiscal management. An individual working as Associate Director in conjunction with the Literary Director could devote significant effort to fund-raising and fiscal management. This individual must coordinate her or his efforts closely with the UI Foundation and might be expected to earn a portion of her or his salary through funding raised. The Associate Director would work year-round on fund-raising and coordinate her or his efforts with the Literary Director so that the latter would still represent the IWP on missions to visit ongoing and prospective sponsors among agencies, programs, and foundations. The task force voted in favor of this option.

This model builds into the IWP structure a clear commitment to fund-raising and fiscal management on the part of an individual not directly involved with other aspects of the program's operations. While certain individuals have the necessary energy, competence and desire to provide adequately for the IWP's fiscal as well as literary operations, the 1998-99 search for a Literary Director suggests that such individuals are few in number.

An Associate Director bridges the gap within the IWP between the Literary Director and the position of Program Supervisor. It provides a focus of effort on fund-raising and fiscal management that also allows the Literary Director and Program Supervisor to devote greater time to general and day-to-day management, respectively. Qualifications for the position of Associate Director might include degrees or experience in Business or Arts Management. Prospective applicants might also have degrees and/or experience in literary studies as well as Business or Arts Management. If future budgets allow for only two positions, we believe it might be more important to have an Associate Director who performs the duties of a Program Supervisor than a Program Supervisor who has no responsibilities for fund-raising. The salary cost for an Associate Director could be limited by stipulating that the individual appointed would fund a portion of her or his salary after one to three years as a percentage of successful fund-raising.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE HOMES FOR THE IWP

There are five possibilities for locating the International Writing Program within the University's administrative structure. These are the College of Liberal Arts, the Graduate College, International Programs, the Office of University Relations, and the Office of the Vice-President for Research. To assign the IWP to the Offices of the Provost or the President would clarify little, because the question of administrative location would re-emerge on a more specific level: where should either of those operations locate its detailed supervision of the IWP? This section explores answers only in the context of recent history and present resources. Major shifts in the mission or formats of the IWP – or those of its possible administrative homes – could affect the decisions to be made in the future. Each of

the five possibilities involves advantages and disadvantages, to be discussed in turn. The considerations include matches of specific missions, financing, staffing, flexibility for adapting to rapidly changing circumstances, positions for contributing to the educational projects of the University, and capacities for publicity to promote the IWP, as well as to make good University use of its strong international standing. In order to continue to flourish, the IWP must meld a genius for the cultivation of literature through entrepreneurial leadership with a greater reliability in fiscal and administrative support. This should enable it to make better contact with Iowa students, faculty, and staff. Yet this should help keep the program concentrating on what has made it distinguished.

Option One: The College of Liberal Arts (CLA) probably would appear to be a logical place to locate the IWP if the prime consideration were that of increasing interaction between the IWP and the greatest number of students, faculty, and UI staff. The 1990s have seen more and more integration of the IWP into academic programs. Culminating in the last year (1998-99) that the CLA encompassed the IWP, as an arm of Comparative Literature, further opportunities for campus curricular and intellectual ties with the IWP have become more evident than before. But like a successful parent, the CLA may have worked itself out of a job in this respect. Now that avenues for educational ties are clearer, the IWP need not stay located in the CLA to take good advantage of them, and there are strong reasons for putting the IWP elsewhere.

The broad mission of the IWP encompasses more than educating Iowans; indeed its center of gravity lies in cultivating literary arts worldwide. Projects of the University focused on contributions distinguishable from education in the liberal arts make a poor match for the CLA. The fiscal and staff resources of the CLA have been stretched even thinner than those of the University as a whole, auguring poorly for local support of the IWP. The CLA offers no special flexibility to the IWP that would equip it to take good advantage of rapidly changing opportunities for national and international support. Nor does it offer publicity advantages to one program among some seventy, particularly when the others are likely to prove more central to the academic mission of the CLA. More links between the IWP and academic programs should be forged. Administration of the IWP by the CLA might also increase benefits for all parties concerned. Overall, though, the CLA is no better suited than several other offices to administer the IWP.

Option Two: The Graduate College offers some of the same advantages and disadvantages as an administrative home for the IWP. In several respects, the IWP resembles some of Iowa's interdisciplinary graduate programs. Yet programs in the Graduate College should feature graduate education. Even though the IWP ought to be contributing in important ways to Iowa's graduate and undergraduate programs, the IWP offers no degrees or certificates in its own right, and it should not be required to do so. One reason is that the IWP works with established writers. This leaves certificates and degrees less relevant for the IWP than for the Writers' Workshop, which offers participants course credits and degrees. (The divergence in participants and devices probably explains why the most productive interactions between the IWP and the Writers' Workshop occur in connection with the Translation Laboratory and the readings sponsored by Prairie Lights rather than academic work of more conventional kinds.) The Graduate College has an exceptional capacity for flexibility in the structures and operations of its programs, and that would be an advantage for the IWP. But the fiscal and staff resources of the Graduate College are more limited than Liberal Arts, and the Graduate College provides no special opportunities for publicity to benefit the IWP. In general, the IWP seems to fit into the Graduate College even more awkwardly than into the College of

Liberal Arts.

Option Three: International Programs makes sense in the abstract as the main administrative tie for the IWP to the University as a whole. The IWP claims fame precisely as an international program. That administrative unit of the Provost's Office includes organizations with diverse missions: programs that grant degrees or certificates and programs that do not; programs on the graduate level or the undergraduate level and programs devoted more exclusively to research or outreach. The experience of International Programs with pursuit of external funds to support its programs should mean understanding for the current rhythms of the IWP. It also should mean access for the IWP to the special sorts of resources needed for fast, flexible adjustments to continuing changes in the environment for funds and participants crucial to the IWP. Likewise International Programs ought to be beautifully positioned to tie the IWP educationally to other endeavors throughout the campus, to help publicize the IWP, and to help the University as a whole build on the international stature of the IWP. Yet the kinds of difficulties now encountered by the IWP are a microcosm of systemic troubles faced by International Programs – and other interdisciplinary programs on the Iowa campus. At the moment, it might not help either the IWP or International Programs to add the other organization's challenges to its own. The limits on staff and funds for International Programs are comparable to limits on the Graduate College. Whereas the IWP has established an international renown that Iowa needs to nurture and use even better than before, present resources in International Programs are inadequate. Were the IWP to be administered as a part of International Programs, without increasing the resources for International Programs, current challenges for the larger organization stand to compound challenges for the IWP.

Option Four: University Relations is the main campus office for publicity, and it has expressed interest in aiding the IWP. If publicity were the major, let alone the only, need in question for the IWP and the University, having the IWP work within University Relations could be an option worth exploring in detail. Publicity for and from the IWP should follow from its excellence in promoting world literature. University Relations is not the place for University programs with such substantive aspirations. It is not funded or staffed to advantage the IWP, it is not especially structured to accommodate the entrepreneurial initiative required for the IWP, nor is it particularly positioned to connect the IWP successfully with education programs on the Iowa campus. Instead, the contribution of University Relations to the IWP should continue to be what it has been in the past: collaboration on efforts to keep the IWP accomplishments prominent in the news.

Option Five: Assignment of the IWP in 1999-2000 to the **Office of the Vice-President for Research** offers an opportunity to explore how this connection might work in the long run. In key respects, the IWP resembles the Obermann Center for Advanced Studies, already located administratively in the Research Office. Both have superb potential for contributing to educational programs across the campus, but less by formal ties to particular curricula than informal inspirations of faculty and students who benefit from access to talented people from around the world. Both require entrepreneurial leadership that scouts external support in ever-changing conditions while searching out internal connections that shift with new faculty and students. They need to be able to adjust internal arrangements quickly to exploit the opportunities presented by agencies and individuals that never sit still. To do this, they need access to an infrastructure for staffing and funding that can smooth the inevitable bumps at the frontiers of creative endeavor, where participants and supporters come from afar as well as closer to home. The Office of the Vice-President for Research has been developed

precisely to provide University encouragement for these sorts of enterprises. It need not insist on sustaining a particular configuration of educational contributions to the larger University, but is structured to facilitate whatever connections make most sense today, while staying flexible for turning later to ties that can make better sense tomorrow. The Research Office also is experienced in publicizing the University's many accomplishments that reach beyond specific curricula and educational programs to works of interest for state, national, and international audiences. There should be ways for this Office to fit the unusual schedule for staffing needs of the IWP into an infrastructure able to meet its peak requirements yet take good advantage of staffers for additional University endeavors in other seasons. At this time, the missions and needs of the IWP and the Office of the Vice-President for Research seem especially well-matched.

IV. ACADEMIC LINKS

Undergraduate Participation: It is not possible to identify all the ways in which undergraduate education in the College of Liberal Arts has been affected by the IWP over the past 32 years. There are no easily accessible records, for instance, of visits by participating writers to undergraduate classrooms, nor are there records of the participation of undergraduates in public readings and lectures. There are some indications that it is only recently that efforts have been made to incorporate the IWP participants in the academic programs of the CLA; it was not until 1993, according to the IWP's Annual Report, that participating writers "contributed written presentations" to panel discussions and classes.

The program was almost 20 years old before it began to offer any credit-bearing course: the first offering of 48W:191/8:191 (International Writing Today) was in Fall 1986. This course was originally offered for 1 s.h. of credit; more recently it has been offered for 1-3 s.h. of S/F (S/U for graduate students) credit. The course meets for a portion of the Fall semester. Class size has been nominally limited to 40, though as the table below shows, more students were often permitted to enroll. The course's faculty member of record has usually been Peter Nazareth, often assisted by the IWP Director and others on the IWP staff. Visiting writers participated in the panels/discussions that provided content for the course, but they did not provide written presentations until 1993 and were not responsible for grading of students' papers for the course.

Since 1996, two courses have been developed for IWP by Professor Shelley Berc. The courses are: 48W:180 (Creative Drawing, Writing, and Storytelling) and 48W:181 (Creativity Workshop). Undergraduates first enrolled in these courses, each of which carry 3 s.h., in 1997. In 1998, Steven Ungar created a 1 s.h. course, 48W:189 (Dialogues on International Literature) based on the weekly seminars at which the IWP writers volunteered to make short presentations on selected topics.

This table shows undergraduate involvement in courses offered by the IWP. Enrollment figures are for undergraduates; they include students who registered but who withdrew:

Semester	48W/8:191	48W:180	48W:181	48W:189
	(1-3 s.h.)	(3 s.h.)	(3 s.h.)	(1-3 s.h.)
Spring 1999	---	---	18	---
Fall 1998	43	---	---	2
Spring 1998	---	---	7	---
Fall 1997	31	7	---	---
Fall 1996	42			
Fall 1995	31			
Fall 1994	35			
Fall 1993	44			
Total	226	7	25	2

Graduate Participation: Since at least the mid-1970s, a section of the Translation Workshop (48:260) each fall has matched the IWP participants with students in the M.F.A. Program in Literary Translation and the Writers' Workshop. Professor Daniel Weissbort has taught this course, with assistance from the IWP staff. The course has often led to sustained interaction and has produced a number of published translations.

Formal participation of the IWP writers in undergraduate and graduate courses during the fall semester is regularly supplemented by invitations from UI faculty to have the writers visit individual class sessions throughout the College. While many of these invitations come from foreign language and related units, there is good reason to continue widening the scope of such classroom visits to include courses in the Arts, Performing Arts, and/or Social Sciences and even beyond the College. This might be done on a voluntary basis if and when the writers felt they could afford time off from other activities during their residency. It might also be possible to include an Arts, Performing Arts, and/or Social Science component in the Dialogues on International Literature course. Another kind of academic link would involve appointing M.F.A. students in Production program as videographers to record the IWP activities for archival and fund-raising purposes. M.F.A. students in translation should continue to be involved in working with the IWP writers on translations leading to publication. Consideration should be given to continuing the production of 100 Words.

Academic links have also taken the form of visits by the IWP participants to schools, colleges, and universities in the area. Grinnell College has been among the most frequent venues for sharing visitors both informally and in conjunction with the ongoing UI-Grinnell

Bridging Project. A final link involves the Writer in Residence program that provided an additional semester of residency at the former Center for International and Comparative Studies.

VI. PROGRAM SIZE AND DURATION

The size of the group of writers and the length of time they stay in Iowa City have varied considerably. Both have implications for the sort of program that takes place here and both bear on considerations of housing and budget.

Program Size: It is difficult to glean a full story from annual reports and documents on the IWP web site, but the program size has ranged from at least the nineteen writers who were here in 1998 to the forty-five who were here in 1991. The 1991 number was ten more than capacity of the rooms in Mayflower could house and the overflow spread to homes in Iowa City. The average number would seem to be between thirty and thirty-five writers. What size is optimal for the IWP? The issue is hard to resolve in the abstract since decisions about who comes in any given year is dispersed among the IWP, the USIA, and other agencies. Any targets to be established below should be understood as approximate. The years when the program was largest seem to have depended in some sense on the income generated for the IWP through USIA funding. This does not strike us as a criterion that should determine future planning.

Option One - 15 to 20 Writers: Many other residency programs (including creative programs but also faculty seminars) have groups of 15 to 20. Reports on the IWP stress the serendipitous connections that writers make with others from vastly different cultures. Cutting the size from the average of 30 to 35 writers would likely reduce such encounters. There is also a remote chance that reducing the numbers would enhance contact among those present.

Option Two - 40 to 45 Writers: Reports suggest that 45 writers made for an unwieldy group in terms of housing and logistics.

Option Three - 25 to 30 Writers: A middle range, lower than the average, seems optimal in terms of critical mass for interaction and administration. This is the option the task force endorses.

Program Duration: From 1967 to 1976, program participants stayed for two semesters. From 1976 to 1984, they stayed for a full semester (four and a half months, with the final two weeks devoted to travel). A more recent pattern has been twelve weeks with two plus weeks spent travelling. The 1999 program is an evident anomaly.

Option One - 2 to 4 Weeks: A stay of two to four weeks is too short to provide the kinds of release from other daily tasks and the interaction that the IWP is meant to foster. Any outreach activities would detract from what is already an extremely brief period of time.

Option Two - 4 to 6 Weeks: A stay of four to six weeks would provide more time for interaction and exchange. It might also simplify logistics related to housing and travel. At the same time, this period might not result in sufficient time to settle in and work that longer residency would provide.

Option Three - 9 to 12 Weeks: This model is the one that has proven successful over the past decade or so and the task force endorses it. We propose that the IWP include in this residency a ten-day festival in late October in order to highlight the IWP's visibility within the UI and local communities. The festival would also be an occasion to promote fund-raising in the region.

VII. HOUSING

Option One - Mayflower Dormitory: Housing for the IWP participants has been provided in the Mayflower Residence Hall: one wing of the eighth floor was reserved each fall semester. Housing costs at Mayflower were paid in part by federal grant funds and by non-UI sources. General Education funds provided additional resources annually to Residence Services for this space. Use of this space by the IWP reduced the number of rooms available for students in the fall when housing was in short supply and it proved impossible to rent this space to UI students for the spring semester only. Between 1996 and 1999, UI International Programs received permission to use the eighth floor rooms in the spring semester to provide temporary housing for international visitors. The revenue generated by renting these rooms was evenly divided between International Programs and Residence Services after expenses were deducted. The Mayflower offered a space for the participants to live adjacent to one another, separated from the other (student) residents. Many of the writers complained about the enforced dormitory living.

Option Two - Iowa House or Some Similar Hotel: The participants for fall 1999 will be housed mainly in Iowa House. This is possible because the program this semester takes place in large part during a period of two weeks in September. It would be hard to secure Iowa House or some other hotel for a longer period, and arrangements might become quite expensive. In addition, the writers would likely be mixed in with other hotel guests, so the adjacent living that was a benefit of the Mayflower would be lost.

Option Three - Bed and Breakfasts or Community Housing: Several bed and breakfast establishments in Iowa City could be secured for longer periods, but none of them is likely to be large enough to house the whole group. The resulting dispersal would not seem desirable in terms of the cohesion of the group. Similarly, having most of the writers housed in one place and the "overflow" spread across the city in private homes, as happened in 1991, does not sound like an optimal solution.

Option Four - An International Center for Writers & Scholars: The University has acquired several facilities, mostly former fraternity houses, and others are under consideration for acquisition. Such facilities might be ideal in that they would be available for international scholars in the spring and summer, and could house the IWP participants in the fall. However, some of these facilities might have as few as 15 rooms, so if a decision were taken to house the program participants in a single such facility then that would have an obvious impact on the size of the program. It might be ideal to secure two such facilities near each other in order to house a group of some 25; if there were additional rooms available they might be used in the fall to house other international visitors.

Option Five - Parklawn: The Parklawn Apartments at 447-449 Riverside Drive provide an excellent option for housing the IWP participants in centrally located facilities managed by

UI. This facility offers efficiency and one-bedroom apartments, equipped with basic utilities. The facility appears ideal for the IWP participants as well as other international visitors whose stays vary from a few weeks to several months. Access to UI and Iowa City bus services is excellent. The apartments are among the most cost effective on campus, with monthly rates from \$274 for an efficiency apartment to \$346 for a one-bedroom apartment, based on a one-year lease.

VIII. CONCLUSION

The members of the task force recommend unanimously that the IWP continue. One key to its success in the next decade will be implementing systematic efforts to obtain more non-UI support so that internal and external resources are brought into a greater balance. Another key is effectiveness in leadership and staffing as described in this report. Finally, solving current problems of housing will be a major step in securing the program's future. We submit this report with a goal of supporting efforts to sustain and build on the numerous benefits the IWP has brought to the University, Iowa City, the State of Iowa, and writers internationally over the past thirty-three years.

[Top](#)



University Libraries, The University of Iowa.

Copyright (c) 1996-1999. The University of Iowa. All rights reserved.

Please send comments to:

[Larry Rettig, Special Assistant, Office of the Vice President for Research](#)

[Lissa Lord, IRIS Research Librarian, \(Webmaster\)](#)

URL: <http://www.uiowa.edu/~iwp>

Last updated: October 4, 1999